

RESPITE, RELATIONSHIPS AND RE-SIGNIFICATION:
A STUDY OF
THE EFFECTS OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLING
ON CHILDREN WITH EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIOURAL DIFFICULTIES,
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE PUPILS' PERSPECTIVE

BY

PAUL WILLIAM COOPER

A thesis submitted to the
School of Education
of the
University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The School of Education
University of Birmingham
P.O. Box 363
Birmingham
B15 2TT
England

October, 1989

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the effects of residential schooling on EBD pupils, in two special residential schools. Major sources of data, for this interactionist study, are the transcripts of interviews with pupils attending the schools, questionnaires and observation.

After examining the social and psychological correlates of EBD, and the therapeutic approaches of pioneer workers in the residential field, the claimed "institutionalizing" effects of residential care are considered. Data from this study is analyzed with reference to these conflicting viewpoints.

The study supports the view that the residential experience can benefit pupils by providing:

respite from negative influences in the family, home-based school and peer group

opportunities for positive pupil achievement

encouragement to form rewarding interpersonal relationships with adults and fellow pupils at the schools.

Negative effects of stigma and loss of family contact are also noted.

The concept of "re-signification" is introduced to describe the process whereby the schools, through organizational and interpersonal means, promote improvements in pupils' self images and the development of non-deviant identities, in contrast with the negative labelling effects of mainstream schools as reported in this and other research.

DEDICATION

TO THE CHILDREN OF FARFIELD AND LAKESIDE

At fifteen I left school and in every way it was like leaving prison. I had no regrets. I felt a real sense of freedom. There was a dance held for those leaving but it was made plain that we weren't welcome. That was okay by us as none of us wanted to go anyway. It was great to be finished with the dump ...

The school didn't have a very good success story as I continued to meet guys from my class in prison.

Jimmy Boyle, p.62, *A Sense of Freedom*,
London: Pan, 1977

Too long a sacrifice
Can make a stone of the heart.

W.B. Yeats, *Easter 1916*,

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Rosanne, Catherine and Emily, for their fortitude and tolerance in the face of the wholesale disruption to family life which they have endured over the past five years, in the service of "daddy's work".

Thanks to Colin Smith, Roland Meighan and Robert Laslett for being attentive supervisors.

Thanks to Farfield and Lakeside pupils and staff for their co-operation, and Farfield staff for covering for my study periods on Thursday afternoons.

Thanks to Lucy and Amstrad for help with the typing.

Finally, thanks to A.S. Neill, W. David Wills and David Hargreaves, among many others, for their wisdom, their integrity and the inspiration I have drawn from their writings.

CONTENTS

	page
CHAPTER 1 : Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2 : Literature Review: Pioneers, Evangelists and others	82
CHAPTER 3 : The Research Approach to Case Studies of Two Residential Schools (EBD)	141
CHAPTER 4 : The Farfield Study	155
CHAPTER 5 : The Lakeside Study	284
CHAPTER 6 : Analysis of Questionnaires	350
CHAPTER 7 : Material Resources in the Fieldwork Institutions	370
CHAPTER 8 : The Quality of the Residential Experience	387
CHAPTER 9 : Conclusion: Respite, Relationships and Re-signification	450
Appendix I Questionnaires used in the study	458
Appendix II Pupils' responses to questionnaire I (18-26)	462
Appendix III Pupils' responses to questionnaire II	463
Appendix IV Staff perceptions	465
Appendix V Some parental views	474
Appendix VI Are residential schools necessary?	484
References	495

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Responses to Question 4 (Pupils' Questionnaire I)	351
II	" 5 "	352
III	" 6 "	352
IV	" 7 "	353
V	" 8 "	354
VI	" 9 "	354
VII	" 10+11 "	355
VIII	" 13 "	356
IX	" 24 "	357
X	" 25 "	357
XI	" 27 "	358
XII	" 12 "	359
XIII	" 14 "	360
XIV	" 15 "	361
XV	" 16 "	361
XVI	" 17 "	362
XVII	" 18-22 "	363
XVIII	" 25 "	364
XIX	" 26 "	364
XX	Comparison of Staffing Levels in the Fieldwork Schools	381
XXI	Goal, Compliance and Involvement Structures in Schools	432

NOTES ON PRESENTATION

Where extracts from interview transcripts are presented in the text:

"I" denotes "Interviewer" (in all cases this is the author of the thesis);

[...] denotes interview material that has been omitted.

Where reference is made, in the analysis of the interview data, to the frequency of particular responses, the number of responses is given, followed by the total number of interviewees, eg. (3/15) refers to 3 responses from the total sample of 15 interviewees.

For reasons of confidentiality all names of places and persons arising in the research data have been replaced with pseudonyms.

The following abbreviations have been used in the text:

EBD : Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties

ESN : Educationally Subnormal

MLD : Moderate Learning Difficulties

RSW : Residential Social Worker

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this introduction is threefold. Firstly, the writer will delineate the origins of the study and its purpose. Secondly, the nature and functions of residential schools for children with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties (EBD) will be considered. Finally, some of the current thought on the environmental factors associated with EBD will be discussed.

(1) ORIGINS OF THE STUDY

The first words that I ever heard Martin speak were probably, "fuck off". The occasion was a most beautifully sunny morning, very early in the autumn term at a residential school for emotionally disturbed children. The place was my classroom. The apparent cause of this remark was my indication that Martin should follow the other seven boys in the class to the daily school assembly. This was Martin's first day in class at his new school. He was 14 Years of age and had been referred to the school where I taught as a result of being expelled from his former school for having physically assaulted a teacher. During this early morning conversation Martin unnecessarily reminded me of his pugilistic experience with teachers. He also made it quite clear that he had no intention of attending that morning's assembly, and, furthermore, (through scarcely stifled tears) I could hit him if I wanted/dared to. I declined the offer, and told him that if he chose he could remain in the classroom whilst the rest of us went to assembly. I was only half expecting him still to be

there when we returned from assembly, but there he was. And whilst that was not the last time that Martin swore at me, and whilst I did not always handle subsequent conflicts with such tolerance and forbearance, it was a positive first step in our relationship. Over the period of a year his resistance to the school and its staff transformed into enthusiasm and involvement. His refusals to return to the school after week-end leaves and short holidays were replaced by occasional requests to forego a week-end leave in order to continue work on the school newspaper that he edited.

Not all of my encounters with pupils were as rewarding as those with Martin. Eric was an aggressive "teacher basher" and he terrorized the younger boys of the school as he grew bigger and stronger. For the 3 years of his residence at the school he seemed to successfully resist all attempts to divert his aggressive tendencies. He did not care (or so he claimed) about anyone except himself, he hated his father, despised his mother and enjoyed the fear that he inspired among the other boys. He never repeated his history of staff assault whilst at the school, but he made many threats. It was with a sense of failure, and scarcely hidden relief that the school observed his final departure. In the follow-up meeting that I had with Eric at his home (where he lived with his parents), however, I was greeted by Eric, not warmly, but with a surprising measure of respect. The most stunning aspect of this visit, however, was the glimpse I gained of a framed photograph occupying a prominent place on a table, showing him and a group of boys from the school. I remarked on this, saying how nice it was to keep such a memento of one's school days. Through his obvious embarrassment he agreed. And as I left he asked me to remember him to

those boys: boys, whom, a few months before, had been the victims of his reign of terror.

These two accounts are subjective impressions from my time as a class teacher in a residential school for boys with emotional and behavioural difficulties. I could have described many similar recollected impressions to indicate the personal impetus behind this study. These two pen sketches are intended to indicate something of the way in which, I believe, the residential school experience touched, in a positive way, the emotional lives of some of these "maladjusted" boys; boys whose life histories read as catalogues of rejection, both of them by others, and by them of others.

This is not to say that in this study I sought to prove the beneficial effects of residential schools for (EBD) children. For in spite of these pleasing, but limited rewards, there were many times when I questioned the value of such institutions, where the pitch of interpersonal tension and conflict could be very difficult to cope with, for both staff and pupils. A major question posed by these experiences was, therefore: are the sometimes meagre (sometimes non-existent) rewards valuable enough to justify the stresses and strains incurred along the way? In this sense the study was a personal quest; an attempt to learn something of the value of the residential endeavour.

A further reason for undertaking this study lies in the generally negative image of residential special education which appears in much of the more recent educational literature in the area of special education,

and the education of disruptive and disaffected pupils. This view is further encouraged by certain social work perspectives which also tend to denigrate the idea of residential care for all but those in the most desperate situations. The present writer argues that whilst those perspectives have contributed to the development of a negative image for residential special schools, as well as a concomitant lowering of morale for workers in the residential sector, those perspectives have been developed with little or no consideration of residential schools and the work that they do. It is now necessary to explore the point just made in a little more detail.

In spite of the ever burgeoning and already extensive literature on the subject of school disruption and emotional and behavioural difficulties in children and young people, there has been comparatively very limited interest shown, in recent years, in the oldest and best established form of educational intervention in this area: namely, the residential special school. Cole (1986) provides a rare exception to this rule by devoting an entire volume to an argument which restates the need for residential schooling among certain children and their families. The integrationist climate in which we presently live, however, is reflected all too clearly in the apologist tone of his book, in which he describes boarding placement as "a pragmatic second best" (p.152). Topping (1983) is less generous in his assessment of the value of residential schooling for disruptive children. In his consumers' guide to the available provision for disruptives, he places residential schooling at the bottom of his list of preferences, seeing it as being of limited effectiveness and excessive financial cost. Topping's consumer, however, is the LEA and his assessment

of the effectiveness of such schools is based upon what he admits to be extremely spartan research evidence. Virtually the same spartan research evidence reappears in the writings of those who might be termed the "anti-segregationists" (e.g.: Galloway and Goodwin, 1979 and 1987). Galloway and Goodwin conclude that there is little reliable evidence to suggest that residential schooling is of direct benefit to EBD pupils, in terms of their academic development and subsequent emotional-social adjustment. They favour, therefore, mainstream provision, arguing that EBD pupils are best treated in the environment in which their problems are exhibited. This view shares a great deal in common with that proposed by writers such as Gillham (1981) and Shuttleworth (1983), who advocate a "systems approach" to disruptive behaviour and emotional difficulties in school children. Whilst such an approach does not by necessity preclude residential solutions to such problems, it is presented by these writers solely in terms of strategies designed for intervention in the family or mainstream school setting, to the exclusion of residential facilities. Other prominent contributors to this line of thought include Rutter et al. (1979) and Reynolds (1976, 1979, 1984).

Another approach which contributes to the negative image of the residential special school (EBD) is that provided by writers, such as Tomlinson (1982), Barton and Tomlinson (1981, 1984) and Ford et al. (1982). These writers show how special education can be seen as serving the needs of particular groups in society at the expense of others. Pupils in special provisions, they argue, are deprived of their right to a mainstream education, in order to serve the interests of mainstream schools, whose elitist, middle class curriculum (hidden and overt) demands docility and

uniformity from its pupils, by being removed from the mainstream setting. Not only is special education seen as serving a social control function in society (Ford et al., 1982), it is also seen as serving the needs of "certain status groups, such as the professionals who work in the special education field, who have a vested interest in the perpetuation of special education as means of enhancing their own power and status (Tomlinson, 1982).

Inevitably, such approaches tend to focus attention on the processes and ideologies which place individuals into this segregated provision, rather than the quality of life experienced by the individual in these surroundings. The intention of such writers is to question the very assumptions underlying the removal of pupils from mainstream education for placement in a stigmatized alternative provision. The present writer believes these to be valid and important contributions to the special education debate, but insists that such writings should not be taken as an evaluation of special education as it is experienced by pupils.

It is those writers in the social work field who have, in recent years, concerned themselves directly with the nature of residential care, who have shown that the current government policy of replacing residential care with community care for the mentally ill, the aged and children in local authority care, has a growing body of critics from within the social work field (Davis, 1981; Potter, 1986). Community care has, however, some powerful supporting evidence. Research by Goffman (1961) into total institutions provided a picture of mental hospitals as drab, dehumanizing, individuality stripping institutions, where human beings became

"objectified", and, ultimately unable to function in the world outside the institution, by virtue of their institutionalization. More recent studies of residential provision for adults (Miller and Gwynne, 1972), and handicapped children (King et al., 1975; Oswin, 1973; and Shearer, 1980) found similar evidence of the depersonalizing and institutionalizing effects of residential care. These studies make little or no reference to residential schools for pupils with emotional and behavioral difficulties. Such schools, however, are condemned by association.

Recent studies which appear to have the greatest relevance to our understanding of residential schools for EBD pupils, have been those concerned with the residential treatment of juvenile offenders. Studies undertaken by Millham et al. (1975), Dunlop (1975) and Cornish and Clark (1975) demonstrate the wide range of regimes which existed in the approved school system. Whilst they indicate through their research the possibilities for enriching personal experiences offered by some institutions, they reveal a picture of the generality of such institutions as impersonal, dehumanizing and mechanistic in their effects on their inmates. A more recent study (Millham et al., 1986) stresses the difficulties experienced by children in residential care (children's homes and C.H.E's) in keeping in adequate contact with their families, and the harm caused by such separation. Studies of secure provision for juvenile offenders (Millham et al., 1978 and Cawson and Martell, 1979) have, similarly, stressed the isolation of inmates from the outside world, and the consequent failure of such institutions to affect changes in the inmates which might deter them from committing further offences upon release. And in spite of the personal enrichment which some inmates

perceive in their relationships with staff, those studies tend to stress the use of such provisions as administrative expedients, rather than as placements fitting the needs of referred individuals.

To find a relatively recent study of residential schooling, which suggests a generally enthusiastic evaluation, we must look to Lambert et al. (1975). This study covered a wide range of residential provision for pupils who would not be considered to be in need of special educational provision, including LEA funded residential secondary schools, private schools, public schools and schools for children of parents in the armed services. This study concluded that certain varieties of residential schooling (particularly the public schools) provided most of their pupils with academic advantages as well as opportunities for positive personal development which were unlikely to be available in a day setting. Whilst the study concludes that in many schools such opportunities are not fully exploited, it is made clear that, in terms of pupil experience, the residential experience can be highly effective, particularly in the area of promoting values and attitudes. This last point is of obvious interest to those concerned with EBD children.

In no way does the present writer wish to condemn or reject any of the studies cited in the preceding paragraphs. Much of what many of these writers have to say is of great interest and relevance to persons who wish to study residential schools for EBD children, as the following thesis will demonstrate. However, not one of these studies focuses on residential schools for EBD pupils, so that whilst such research is of relevance to such a study, it is inevitably shaped in order to answer questions which

arise from the particular character of the provision under study. Such character is determined by, among other things, the historical traditions through which the provision developed, the route by which "inmates" are admitted, the involvement of particular occupational groups (eg; medical staff, prison officers, teachers) in the administration and control of the provision, and in particular, the socio-legal context of the provision (in terms of the rights granted to or withheld from, inmates in the institution).

The assumption that residential schools for EBD pupils can be judged on the basis of research evidence drawn from these other forms of residential provision is, therefore, to say the least questionable. In spite of this, an article entitled "Residential schools: issues and developments", by Spencer Millham (1987), contains the reservation that "there has not been a great deal of recent research into residential schools" (p.9), and bases its conclusions upon evidence drawn from some 30 references, only two of which report recent research evidence based on studies of residential schools for EBD pupils. One of these references is a follow up study of pupils from a residential school (EBD) (Lampen and Neill, 1985), whilst the other reports a survey carried out into parental involvement in such schools (Upton et al., 1986). Whilst such concerns as parental and family involvement, and the effects of long term separation of children from families are the important concerns on which Millham's article focuses, it is dangerous to base remarks about one form of provision on research evidence from a different, though closely allied, field.

The present study, then, is an attempt to shed some light on an area which has been neglected by educational researchers in recent years. Such a study is made all the more necessary by the negative aura which surrounds EBD residential special schools, and which threatens the morale of those who work in them at the present time (Cole, 1986).

It should also be stated, for the sake of balance, that such a study is made necessary by those writers in the social work field who have begun, in recent years, to challenge the wisdom of the community care policy which seeks to replace much residential provision. These writers suggest that residential care for children can be less damaging to family relationships than fostering (Davis, 1981; Potter, 1988; Wagner, 1988). Once again, however, it would be a mistake to allow such writers to persuade us that their views represent an attitude toward the type of institution which this thesis aims to consider. The importance of these and other views to our understanding of residential schooling for EBD pupils can only be gauged through their assessment in relation to research based on such institutions.

It should also be stated at this point, that the Wagner report (1988), in particular, represents an affirmation that residential care does have a positive role to play in meeting the needs of certain sections of the population. The report itself offers a view of residential care which demonstrates the positive effects which residential provision can have on its clients. The report also stresses the need for integration of residential and community services, as a means of making the benefits of residential care open to a wider group of people for short term periods.

With regards to children, the report argues that short term residential care placements can provide families and children with respite from family crises, prepare children, through structured programmes, for permanent placements during periods of transition, and provide settings which enable siblings to remain united. In such ways residential care can support and even be a preferred option to fostering. Furthermore, it is recognized that secure provision for children who are "a risk to themselves and others" (p.97), is a more appropriate setting for such children, than the alternative which is often "adult institutions". The report also refers to the positive value of therapeutic communities for "socially and emotionally damaged children" in providing support, "training and counselling to children, and in some cases their families".

It is too early to assess the impact of the Wagner Report. The stress the report places, however, on the positive effects on clients of residential care, coupled with a strong emphasis on the obligations to serve clients' rights and needs, represents a modern and enlightened view of residential care which will be welcomed by many residential workers, and may contribute toward a modification of popular perceptions held of residential care. Whether the Wagner report (after the Audit Commissioners' attack [Wagner Report, p.1] on the present government's expenditure on the expansion of private residential care, in apparent contradiction of the policy of community care [Audit Commission, 1986]) will lead to policy changes, remains to be seen. The important thing is, that the report introduces a weighty counterbalance into the residential care debate.

(11) THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS FOR EBD CHILDREN

Residential special schools, particularly those providing facilities for 52 weeks of the year, are unique among educational establishments. This uniqueness lies partly in the totality of these institutions. Goffman (1961) defines a total institution as:

...a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life. (p.11).

There are of course other institutions, such as hospital schools, Community Homes with Education, and institutions for juvenile offenders which bear the same characteristics of totality, sometimes to a greater extent than residential special schools. The residential special school differs from these, however, in that it is designated with the primary function of being an *educational* establishment. Under the terms of the 1981 Education act pupils are referred to such establishments in order to supply their special educational needs; this is not true of the other establishments mentioned, in which education is provided as a service in addition to the more central concerns of the institution. In the residential special school the residence of the pupils is considered a necessary condition for the fulfilment of the pupils' special educational needs. There are of course other forms of boarding education, such as residential secondary schools, public and independent schools, as well as institutions of higher education. These other forms of boarding education, however, often cater for inmates only during term time. Also the selection of inmates is made, more usually, on the basis of the inmate's desire, or that of his/her parents, to be there, as opposed to any officially legally

defined need. More often than not, in the case of primary and secondary boarding schools (both independent and state funded) parental choice is made on non-educational grounds, such as those of tradition or social status (Lambert, 1975), with educational need being of only secondary importance.

It is a point worth considering that the earliest efforts to cater for the needs of young people with emotional and behavioural difficulties, were conceived of as requiring, almost exclusively, residential treatment, though not necessarily with formal education. As Bridgeland (1971) puts it, with reference to the work of the "pioneers" who set up the first schools for the "maladjusted" in the first half of the 20th century:

All ... would have considered much of their preventive and therapeutic work with this sort of child virtually impossible out of the context of the complete experience of a residential school. (p. 34)

Ron Dawson (1981) identifies four "tenets", which he suggests, are held in common by the pioneers of Bridgeland's study. These are;

1. The showing of unconditional love towards pupils/inmates;
2. The importance of the inmate's right to "free expression", in order to act out repression or reveal symptoms for treatment;
3. The importance of the development of self discipline through "self government";
4. The efficiency of psychoanalysis in the treatment of "maladjustment".

It was a commonly held belief among the early practitioners that the pursuit of these tenets is best achieved by the removal of the individual from his environment to a "planned environment", where conditions which might conflict with the therapeutic effects of these forms of treatment are excluded.

The reasons for this emphasis on residential treatment are fairly wide ranging. Bridgeland (1971) suggests that it is due in part to the nature of the clientele, some of whom were without families or from inadequate families, and, thus, in need of a substitute home. Others, considered to be "delinquent", were taken into therapeutic communities as an alternative to punitive detention. Later, workers such as W. David Wills took charge of children who had been evacuated from their homes during the war but who proved to be too emotionally disturbed to be successfully billeted with ordinary families. In these cases residential placement arose out of practical necessity. A further point worth considering is based on Laslett's (1983) account of the changes that have occurred over the past 40 years in the dominant perceptions of maladjusted children, held by practitioners in the field. The 1940's and 50's are characterized by the predominance of a psychodynamic approach to the "treatment" of maladjustment which stems from the work of Freud. Broadly speaking, this approach explains an individual's emotional disturbance and/or failure to conform to socially desirable norms in terms of failures in the individual's early environment (Khan et al., 1981). Such theories focus on the mother-child relationship in early infancy and the failure of this relationship to provide the child with its basic needs for love and acceptance. The mother's failure to accept the child leads to the child's

failure to accept him/herself, and this in turn leads to his/her need to project personal feelings of anxiety or aggression on to others as she/he grows older. On the basis of this understanding the most effective form of treatment involves the placement of the individual in an environment which allows for opportunities to act out anxiety or aggression whilst continuing to receive the love and acceptance of others. Clearly, in order to achieve the control over the environment which allows for such behaviour it is necessary to remove the individual from the wider society which attempts to control deviant behaviour by suppression or rejection.

Of equal relevance here is the unconventional nature of these ideas, and the unsympathetic response that they popularly received. It is perhaps partly for this reason that many of the pioneers chose to work in independently funded institutions, out of sight of both the public and officialdom, as Bridgeland puts it:

[...] most [...] [of the] pioneers created their work around themselves and would not easily have submitted to the daily interference likely in a non-residential setting (p.35)

Bridgeland also points out that pupils with behavioural problems who could not be catered for in state schools, prior to the official recognition of maladjustment as an educational handicap in 1945, more often went to independent schools, which were inevitably residential schools, simply because no other educational provision outside of mainstream state schools was available.

All of the above factors contributed to what became a virtually unchallenged assumption, by the time of the Underwood Report (1955), that maladjustment was to be treated in residential settings. This is understandable, since the only models available tended to be these institutions. However, whilst systematic assessment of the effects of residential treatment on the maladjusted has been at best vague and at worst non-existent (Balbernie 1966; Laslett, 1977; Galloway and Goodwin, 1979; Topping, 1983), provision for "maladjusted" children has developed since 1945, along with dramatic increases in the numbers of children "statemnted" or "ascertained" as "maladjusted" (between 1961 and 1971, the increase was of 237% [Sewell, 1981]), also there has been a disproportionate accelleration in the provision of day places. In 1974 the number of residential schools for maladjusted children between the ages of 2 and 16 was 124, compared to 68 day schools (Laslett, 1977). A dramatic change in policy is indicated when we consider that in 1955 there were 32 LEA funded boarding schools for maladjusted pupils and only 3 day schools, and in addition, a further 1,000-plus maladjusted children were being placed by LEA's in 158 independent boarding schools (Warnock, 1978). The 1970's was a period of great expansion of day provision for disruptive pupils in the form of small off-site units and special classes within mainstream schools (Topping, 1983).

The placement of pupils with behavioural problems in on and off-site units is less costly than placing them in residential schools (Topping, 1983) and administratively more efficient in terms of the speed with which the placement can be made (Tattum, 1985). There are then, pragmatic reasons for moves towards the integration of disturbed pupils

into their mainstream schools and units located in home areas. The recognition that some forms of maladjustment can be seen as a product of the individual's environment (eg. Jones, 1960) leads to a focusing on the family as an object for treatment or other aspects of the individual's social system (Shuttleworth, 1983). From this viewpoint the child's removal from the system can often simply mask rather than cure the problem. Furthermore, the removal of the pupil from a mainstream school often means depriving the pupil of access to valuable educational resources which are not found in smaller off-site units and residential schools (Topping, 1983). In addition to these points, placements in the mainstream school, it has been suggested, can also lessen the adverse effects of labelling of the individual as "impaired" or "handicapped" (Warnock, 1978) and makes the process of reintegration much simpler as well as making the possibility of short term treatment practically more feasible and less of an emotional trauma for the individual. (This last point, is shown by Galloway and Goodwin (1987) to be in need of qualification, on the basis of their observations of the effects of integrationist tendencies in education authorities on the basis of the Warnock Report. They found that an over reliance on "locational integration" resulted in what amounts to locational segregation, and the resulting stigmatization of SEN pupils. This, they found, was combined with restricted access to mainstream educational facilities, to the extent that many such pupils were found to be less well served, educationally, than they would be by off-site provision).

Residential treatment then, is no longer seen as synonymous with the term special education; it is now seen by the policy makers and many theorists as a last resort for only those extreme cases which cannot be

catered for within their home environments. The Warnock Committee (1978) cites the following conditions which necessitate residential treatment:

- (i) Where a child with severe or complex disabilities requires a combination of medical treatment, therapy, education and care which it would be beyond the combined resources of a day special school and his family to provide, but which does not call for his admission to hospital;
- (ii) Where learning difficulties or other barriers to educational progress are so severe that the whole life of the child needs to be under constant and continuous educational influence, for example, where the child is suffering from severe sensory loss, extensive neurological damage or malfunction, severe emotional or behavioural disorder or severe difficulties in communication;
- (iii) Where a child has severe disability and his parents cannot provide at home the sustained attention that he needs, or could not do so without unacceptable consequences for family life and the well being of other children in the family;
- (iv) Where poor family conditions or disturbed family relationships either contribute to or exacerbate the child's educational difficulty.

(8.16, Warnock Report 1978)

In addition to these points, the report stresses the need for the residential school to maintain close contact with parents and to encourage, though not force, pupils to spend weekends at home regularly.

The residential school then, can still be seen to have a place in the sphere of special education, albeit a somewhat less central one, and still has a very specific role in relation to the treatment of pupils with behavioural disorders. Laslett (1977) describes the "emotional purpose" of residential treatment for emotionally and behaviourally disturbed children in the following terms:

For the child it is his opportunities of living with adults beside his own parents which can only be attained in a total

environment that is different from his home and that provides him with meaningful corrective emotional, social and educational experiences. For the child's family it is their need to have opportunities to come to an understanding of his difficulties and their aim, an understanding which is impossible if the child's presence in the home causes perpetual stress among family members (p. 62).

In briefly sketching the changing perspectives which have been held on the use of residential treatment for emotionally and behaviourally disturbed children, two facts emerge. Firstly, residential treatment is a relatively long established form of treatment for such individuals. Secondly, changes which have occurred in the degree to which such treatment is advocated have not been based upon any detailed knowledge of the effects of such treatment: we know almost as little about the actual effects of residential treatment on maladjusted children in 1989 as was known in 1945.

(iii) EBD AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS: A SOCIOLOGICAL VIEW.

Previous sections of this introductory chapter have dealt with perceptions of residential care, particularly as provision for EBD children. We have noted that there has been a tendency to dismiss residential care as a last resort and a sign of failure by social workers. In the education sector, concomitant with the move towards community care in the social work sphere, community based initiatives, particularly on and off-site units, have become increasingly preferred alternatives to residential provision for EBD children. It must be observed that whilst the negative aura which seems to surround residential schools for EBD children may owe something to the failings observed in other areas of the residential sector, the increased use of community based educational resources for EBD children can take some justification from what is currently understood about some of the factors which influence and are associated with EBD. The present writer has no intention of entering into the residential vs. community care debate; it is necessary, however, for the reader's full appreciation of the following study, to explore some of the home and community based factors associated with EBD in school children. These factors are of particular importance when we examine the perceptions and preoccupations of the pupils in the following study.

In order to place these important sociological considerations in their correct relation to the present thesis, reference must be made to some of the research findings which are dealt with more fully in Chapters 4 and 5. The reason for this slightly awkward arrangement lies in the fact that the ideas drawn upon (to be explored below) were produced in the

analysis of the research material. Whilst these ideas form a cornerstone upon which the conclusions of the thesis rest, their exposition is so lengthy as to appear as a digression between the report of the research and the analysis and conclusions drawn from the research.

The study which forms the basis for this thesis is principally concerned with pupils' perceptions of their experience in residential schools (EBD). A thread running throughout these pupils' accounts is an on-going comparison between their residential experience and their experience of family life and mainstream schooling. This area of concern, highlighted by the pupils in this study, led the writer to explore some of the theoretical work which has already been done in this field, as a means of assessing the generality of their experience. These theoretical positions also provide a further justification for mounting this study since they identify a number of social 'problems' for the pupils and their families which we would expect the residential schools to confront.

The major areas of concern to emerge in this connection are: pupils' family problems, (mainstream and day 'special') school-based problems, and factors associated with home-based peer groups. A particular point to note, is the sense of relief which is expressed by many pupils at gaining respite from the pressures and difficulties of their home situations which residential facilities provide. The remainder of this section will deal with each of these three areas in some detail.

(a) *Family Problems*

A major area of concern identified by pupils in this study related to their family situations. The most commonly cited difficulty was that of repeated disharmony and discord between pupils and their siblings and parents. Such conflict took verbal and occasionally physical form. Parental marital disharmony, and conflicts relating to being one of a single parent family also featured prominently in these accounts. Family based delinquency is mentioned by one pupil as a source of family discord.

In each of the cases mentioned above, the pupils indicated that separation from their parents had led to improvements in these adverse conditions, including: improvements in the pupil's state of mind (he felt more relaxed, or happier), improvements in the quality of the family-pupil relationship, improvements in the pupils' behaviour towards the members of his family. These improvements are most often attributed by the pupils to changes in their own attitudes and perceptions, which are brought on by counselling and informal relations with residential staff, and the opportunities that respite from the difficulties of family life provides for self examination, and the chance to simply "think things out".

Many studies have shown high correlations between childhood deviance and family difficulties. West and Farrington (1973), in their study of 400 eight year old delinquent children, identified the following associated factors:

low family income

large family size
one parent with a criminal record
unsatisfactory child rearing methods.

In addition to these family problems the delinquent sample had a lower mean IQ than the control group sample. Rutter et al. (1975) reported a high correlation between pupil deviance in school and parental separation or marital disharmony. Reid (1975) includes all of the above factors in his list of family traits linked with school truancy, and adds:

paternal/ maternal unemployment
overcrowded living conditions
poor/old housing
one parent families
poor material conditions in the home
social pathologies (eg: alcoholism, illness, etc.)
hostility to authority
lack of parental interest in children's schooling.

Rutter (1975) draws a distinction between those 'maladjusted' children who suffer from 'neurotic' (psychiatric) disorders and 'conduct' (socialized) disorders. The latter is the larger group and can be differentiated from the neurotic group by, among other things, the tendency of the conduct disordered child to come from families where parents are:

inconsistent and ineffective in their disciplining of their children;
habitually involved in discord and quarrelling with each other;
not in the habit of displaying affection overtly.

Tattum (1982) refers ^{to} Feldhusen's research, which suggests that children who regularly misbehave at school (in USA) tend to have parents who are:

- indifferent or hostile to their children;
- emotionally and socially distant from each other;
- liable to enact violent displays of temper;
- prone to marital discord;
- likely to employ corporal punishment on their children.

Millham et al. (1978), found that "the families of boys in secure units are typical of those where delinquency is a common adaptation among the children" (p.39). They also found the following family related characteristics in the boys' case histories:

- run away from home at an early age (26%);
- brought up by a relative (15%);
- had step parents (34%);
- experienced cruelty and neglect (38%);
- been separated from mother (21%);
- mentally unstable parents (38%);
- violent parents (28%);
- heavy drinking parents (28%);
- parents who are frequently absent from home (43%);
- parents who have extra-marital affairs (50%).

With reference to their earlier study (Millham et al., 1975), the authors point out that these family characteristics compare closely with those of boys in approved schools, thus suggesting that such family difficulties are

by no means the sole preserve of those "extreme" children, who cannot be successfully contained in the more 'open' institutions. Hoghugh (1978), in his study of 'extreme' children identified family difficulties of a very similar nature in the pupils of Aycliffe school. Family conditions which Hoghugh found to be particularly prevalent were:

- poor family income;
- parental divorce;
- presence of step parent;
- long standing marital difficulties;
- siblings in care;
- rejecting, violent parents;
- parental delinquency and/or imprisonment.

In a consideration of a wide range of research on juvenile delinquency, Hoghugh (1983) echoes many of the above points and concludes:

... perhaps the single most powerful and constant correlate of persistent delinquency in a population is the complex of factors termed 'parental behaviour' or parenting. (p.109)

On the basis of the evidence explored here, it would appear to be the case that socially deviant behaviour among children of school age has often been associated with family circumstances that are marked by:

- economic deprivation
- severe emotional tension and discord
- delinquent tendencies

Such family conditions are likely to be sources of personal dissatisfaction and other difficulties to their members (Reid, 1987). This point will emerge as being central to the perceptions of many of the children in the present study. It will be shown that many of these find their home and family conditions intolerable, and place a high value on the respite from these difficulties that the residential setting provides.

It must also be noted that the previous research, outlined above, has dealt almost entirely with external indicators of the family situation, such as details contained in official documents (school files, social work reports etc.). Dunlop (1974), for instance, in her study of 493 approved school trainees, found the subjects "evasive" (p.72) when questioned in face to face situations about their family relationships. Only 3% of her sample (n=493) admitted to personal family difficulties, whilst 80% believed that the majority of their fellow trainees had family problems. A lack of detailed information on family members' perceptions of their personal situations is not a feature of the present study, owing to the frank and revealing information that is given by the pupils interviewed.

Whilst pupils in this study show a concern for family problems which reflects research findings on the subject, and declare satisfaction with the respite from these difficulties that residential schooling provides, we must ask the question "what, if any, is the value of such respite?" It is argued that respite can be a vital (though not the only) means of averting the development of certain forms of deviance, which occur in some children as a result of particular types of family difficulty.

The leading correlate of family characteristics and childhood deviance has been repeatedly found to be relatively low family income (eg. West and Farrington, 1973; Hoghughi, 1983). Rutter and Giller (1983) state, in relation to this point, that absolute measures of wealth and poverty are less important than the individual's perceptions and expectations: one generation's luxuries are the next generation's necessities. These two points combine with particular force when we consider Reid's (1987) recent account of the effects of poverty on family life and the difficulties professionals such as teachers sometimes have in appreciating the nature of poverty and the way in which it may impinge upon school life. Reid suggests that when school pupils become problematic teachers and social workers often seek explanations in the pupils' home environment. And whilst such professionals often recognize poverty as a factor contributing to the pupil's difficulties, they more often place a heavier emphasis on what they perceive to be the personal qualities of the parents. Reid describes how such perceived personal qualities can often be more directly attributed to the effects of poverty, rather than being coincidental with or even contributory towards the poverty.

In mapping some of the effects of poverty on family life, Reid shows how the personal deficiency explanations preferred by some professionals are more than likely inversions of the truth and represent a failure of empathy:

Surviving poverty requires enormous efficiency, energy and staying power, for you cannot regularly afford the things that make life easier. (p.194)

Poverty, argues Reid, often forces families into substandard living accommodation, which leads to further problems of overcrowding and ill-health. Consequently, the family in poverty will be faced with material deprivations which will lead to "impossible choices" between essentials. It is the family with exceptional resilience and fortitude which does not fall into patterns of social conflict in the face of such circumstances. The problem of child rearing is particularly acute in such a situation:

[children] ... are less likely to have access to things which others take for granted and which they, themselves, see as important: a reasonable choice of toys, clothes [etc.] ... Children can be acutely aware of these deficits in their lives and of the embarrassing situations and restrictions which they face as a result. (p.195)

Children may respond to these problems in a variety of ways, with some of their responses being of a deviant nature. The parents too are affected by both what they may see as their own inadequacy to provide their children with perceived necessities, as well as their children's response to the situation:

[parents] ... are forced by the multi-dimensional problems of living in poverty to lower their expectations and to adopt child rearing practices of which they themselves do not approve.
(p.196)

Reid's work leads us towards a model of how social difficulties can be seen as being a major component in sparking off family stress; such stress can then lead to further behaviour which serves only to exacerbate the family difficulties and so increase the stress:

SOCIAL DIFFICULTY

(eg. poverty)



FAMILY STRESS



DEVIANCE



FAMILY STRESS

We find ourselves here dealing with a concept not unlike that of "secondary deviance" (Lemert, 1967), in that it is the reaction to a situation which is in itself a reaction to a set of (perceived) adverse circumstances, that may lead to the manifestation of problematic behaviour. And it is the complexity in such chains of causation that can create difficulties for those who attempt to understand and cope with the outcomes of the chain. An example of such a chain of events is provided in the present study. A boy (John, in the Farfield sample, chapter 4) describes a home situation which he clearly feels to be marked by material deprivation. This sense of deprivation contributes to considerable internal family conflict between himself, his unemployed elder brother and his single parent mother. It is clear that such conflict is exacerbated by, if not a direct result of, the fact that the mother, in order to earn sufficient money, works unsociable hours in a "club". This unhappy combination of circumstances explodes into very serious situation when the boy absconds from the day school he attends, and a member of staff contacts the boy's mother. Not only does the teacher's action, in the eyes of the boy, pour oil on the already troubled interpersonal waters of family life, it also creates additional

stress and inconvenience for the boy's mother who, owing to her job, usually sleeps for much of the day. The boy's reaction to what he sees is an unnecessarily extreme and malicious response to his truancy by the teacher is, in the boy's eyes, only reciprocally extreme: he returns to the school and assaults the teacher. At the heart of this situation is family stress: the boy believes that the teacher intends only to "wind up" his mother by phoning her whilst she is resting, with a message which will cause her anxiety and anger. When the boy assaults the teacher, therefore, he is not only responding to the teacher's action, but also the conflict and stress which already exists within his family.

This example is particularly apposite to the present discussion because it concerns a pupil who clearly values the respite which residential schooling provides, for both himself, from family conflict, and his mother from the difficulties he believes she experiences in looking after him. This boy claims that since he has been a pupil at the school there has been an improvement in his relationship with his mother; home visits are less fraught with conflict. In this way the residential school, for this boy at least, provides what Cole (1986) calls a "cooling off" period for child and parent, in which a "rewakening of dormant affection" (p.31) can be allowed to take place.

This notion of "dormant affection" is of particular significance, since it would seem that affection between the parties involved is often an early casualty in the war between families and adverse social circumstances. It is also significant because the family's failure to provide particular types of affective response to children is often seen as

a contributing factor in the creation of EBD in children. Stott (1982) lists 4 "maladjustment conducive family situations", all of which are centred on the failure of the family to meet the child's affective needs; these are:

1. when the child is under threat of expulsion from the family;
2. when the child loses the preferred or only parent and is left with an emotionally unsatisfactory substitute;
3. when the mother is undependable as a source of affection and the father, even if available, offers no adequate alternative;
4. when the child fears the loss of the preferred or only parent.

It is easy to see how these situations might arise from the adverse conditions described by Reid (1987), or the other debilitating factors surrounding many EBD children in their home circumstances, such as parental criminality, overcrowding, divorce, illness etc. In each case the deprivations and frustrations which arise from these difficulties can leave the parent or parents drained of emotional resources on which children often depend.

Pringle's (1980) seminal work on the "needs of children" is particularly valuable at this stage of the discussion because it describes the long term effects of a child's continued exposure to circumstances in which his/her essential affective needs are denied. According to Pringle, a child's emotional development is determined by the extent to which his/her needs are fulfilled in the following areas:

1. need for love and security;

2. need for new experiences;
3. need for praise and recognition;
4. need for the chance to exercise personal responsibility.

These needs, when fulfilled, feed the individual's sense of self-worth and help to develop his/her self esteem, through the individual's internalization of the view held of him by those people who are important to him. The adverse family circumstances described by Stott (1982) might obviously result in a failure to meet these needs. Similarly, the situations described by Reid (1987), and the other writers identified above, could militate against their fulfilment. As Pringle states:

while favourable socio-economic conditions do not necessarily ensure that children's psychological needs are met, it is much more difficult to do so in circumstances of severe socio-economic strain. (p.113)

Thus children from large families with low incomes; handicapped children; children living apart from their families; and children from racial minority groups are all considered by Pringle to be "at risk". It is the strains and insecurities which families experience in coping with the pressures of such circumstances which can impair their ability to attend to their children's fundamental psychological needs. Where the particular family difficulty extends over generations the problem has an added dimension:

... to be able to give and receive love it needs to have been experienced and many parents have themselves been unloved if not rejected in childhood. (Pringle, 1980, p.114)

The key mechanism at work, in achieving the healthy psychological development believed by Pringle to be of such importance, is modelling. Thus the "child from a discordant home is liable himself to become emotionally disturbed or antisocial" (Pringle, 1980, p.86), and furthermore he is likely to have impaired his "ability to give as an adult unselfish loving care in the parental relationship" (p.86). In this way also the image which the child develops of himself may be affected: the child internalizes the image which his apparently uncaring parents appear to have of him as worthless or insignificant.

The link between low self-esteem and EBD has long been recognized (eg. Wills, 1960; Neill, 1968; Hargreaves, 1981; Cole, 1986; Bond, 1987). Recently, Lund (1987) demonstrated, through a comparison of the scores achieved by pupils in an EBD school on a standardized measure of self esteem (the Lawrence Self-Esteem Questionnaire) with those achieved by (not EBD) pupils in a mainstream day school, that the EBD pupils scored significantly lower than the mainstream pupils.

Many of the writers mentioned in the last paragraph are, of course, writing about the effects which schools have on their pupils' sense of self worth. At present we are chiefly concerned with family influences, but the consequences of low self-esteem noted by these writers are significant to the present argument and must be dealt with briefly (they will be given lengthier treatment in a later section). Perhaps the most elegant demonstration of the social consequences of low self-esteem in school children is provided by Hargreaves (1967). He demonstrates the way in which a selective school differentiates between its pupils in such a way

that the psychological needs, described elsewhere by Pringle (1980), that are shared by all are only fulfilled for selected pupils through the experiences provided by the officially approved curriculum ('hidden' and overt). The pupils whose needs are not fulfilled still have those needs and, therefore, seek fulfilment outwith the realms of official approval, notably through associating with similarly disadvantaged peers who collectively form a delinquent sub-culture. The organization which deprives them of status, and treats them as failures, becomes an object of resentment and hatred; its values are inverted. The pupils gain status and esteem among their peers through acts of defiance, disruption and delinquency.

In Hargreaves's (1967) study, many of the socio-economic disadvantages described earlier, particularly low income, overcrowding and poor housing, are present in a high degree among the study sample. No data is presented to reflect the emotional quality of the pupils' family lives. It must be observed, however, on the basis of the earlier arguments of this section, that the poor socio-economic circumstances outlined coupled with the school's failure to contribute to a pupil's sense of self worth, is a likely recipe for emotional and behavioural difficulties. In fact, the child whose family fails to fulfil adequately what Pringle describes as his/her basic psychological needs, is also likely to be a child who fails at school, and thus sustain further damage to his/her self esteem. For the child's intellectual development is strongly influenced by the extent to which his needs for new experiences, praise and recognition are fulfilled. The child whose psychological needs are not met is more likely to be perceived as being "intellectually slow", and as Hargreaves and many others

have noted, such pupils often find school to provide very unrewarding experiences. As Pringle (1980) puts it:

... the intellectually slow, the culturally disadvantaged, the emotionally neglected or disturbed get far less, if any, praise and recognition. Yet their need is far greater. (p.97)

This is particularly the case when schools tend to offer reward for "achievement rather than effort" (Pringle, p.100). The fact of originating in such a disadvantaged background can also be detrimental in the extent to which it may influence the sorts of preconceptions and expectations teachers have of their pupils' degree of social adjustment and intellectual ability (Sharp and Green, 1975), whilst perceptions of intellectual ability can also influence the depth and range of the educational experiences provided by teachers for pupils (Keddie, 1971).

The literature shows, as we have seen, that exposure to severe difficulties can have highly negative consequences for a child's social, emotional, academic and intellectual development, with the related possibility that the child will develop into an adult who will prove an inadequate parent. The need for some form of intervention to break this destructive cycle is blindingly obvious. It is argued in the present thesis that the residential school can play a vital part in this intervention process under particular circumstances.

As subjects of the present study will show, the residential school provides them with much needed respite from family difficulties.

The simple act of removing children from the types of family situation described, at least arrests the negative consequences on the child of continued exposure to the situation. The destructive cycle is broken, for at least a temporary period. At the same time, the child's removal from the home situation can relieve some of the emotional tensions in the family. For, although the child's emotional and behavioural difficulties may be seen to emanate from family circumstances, once these difficulties are manifest they become a further cause of family stress. This point is supported by research carried out by the present writer into parental perceptions of and EBD school and its effect on their children (Cooper, 1985). Eleven out of 15 pupils' parents who replied to a questionnaire stated that their sons had improved in their attitudes and behaviour in the family setting; the same number described their sons as "easier to get on with" (p.26) since commencing attendance at a special boarding school (EBD).

Respite, in itself, is not necessarily going to affect any positive improvements in the home situation. Respite alone is merely the evacuation of the child from the actual and potential dangers of an unstable family situation. For some of the children in the present study, removal from difficult family circumstances is perceived as a longed for chance to "relax", or to "have a rest". Once such a period of rest is instigated, opportunities for contemplation of the situation and clear headed planning for the future arise. Social work intervention in the family may be one option, along with a positive programme for the child provided by the residential school.

The residential school is not, of course, the only possible source of respite. Potter (1986) describes the strong impulse among writers on social work practice, to seek community based alternatives to group residential care:

... residential care, particularly long-term residential care, is increasingly seen as "the last resort" of a last ditch service".
(p.1)

Foster care is seen as the most desirable alternative to the child remaining in an unsatisfactory natural family situation, though, where possible, the natural family is preferred. According to Potter, this view is based upon two unfounded assumptions:

1. Residential establishments are, *per se*, dehumanizing, institutionalizing; of the type described by Goffman (1960);
2. The care provided in the child's natural home, or in a foster family is qualitatively better than anything on offer in residential establishments.

In a later section of this thesis we will see that Goffman's model of the "total institution" fails to apply to the institutions that are under study here. Potter's second point would certainly place its advocates at odds with the authors of many of the studies discussed so far in this section, and, in particular, the authors of the Wagner Report (1988).

Potter suggests that one of the major advantages of residential care over foster care lies in the way in which residential care can be seen as a source of support and assistance to the beleaguered natural family.

Cole (1986) also describes some adverse effects of fostering on the child and his/her natural family, that the residential school can avoid:

... placements can break down because of some children's dislike for living in a different family, with its inbuilt demands for emotional closeness. They prefer the diffuse, less intense relationships which are likely to be required in a children's home or boarding school ... Fostering can be resisted by the child's natural parents, who might find it more painful and insulting, and feel guilty if their son or daughter is placed at the heart of another family rather than a residential school where staff are likely to be seen as less of a threat. (p.33)

Thus, fostering can be seen as a direct threat to the natural family in a way that the residential school is not. In fostering the natural family is replaced, and can be perceived as having been discarded (however temporarily) in favour of a preferred alternative family. The residential school, on the other hand, offers an alternative to the natural family, which can work as a family support rather than a rival.

Traditional views of residential care tend to see it in terms of what Davis (1981) describes as "substitute" family care, as opposed to an "alternative" to, or "supplement" to family care. It is these last two descriptions of residential care which best fit the schools in the present study. Both of these forms can coexist with the child's natural family life. Also, as Davis suggests, where families become actively involved in the work of the residential unit, important, positive changes in attitude can take place (both in the family and the child).

This is not to say that the residential school is always embraced wholeheartedly by families and children. As the present study will reveal, initial reactions to placement are often marked by pupils' feelings of homesickness and the belief that they have been rejected by their families. These feelings, however, soon disappear, by and large, and parents and children begin to perceive the institution as an alternative, or supplement to the family situation. As one adult (Ballard, 1987), reflecting on his childhood experiences of a foster home, remarks:

I wonder why being in a family setting with all the subtle differences of meaning of word and gesture, all the differences in degree and perhaps kind in value systems, all the little traps which show you are not part of the family, is considered so much more normal than living in an understanding institution? (p.13)

It has been argued in this section that the residential school can provide that much needed respite from harmful and distressing family circumstances, without, necessarily, creating the confusions and traumas associated with fostering. The enforced closeness of the family situation is a vital influence in the social and emotional development of children (Stott, 1982). In a happy, harmonious family, comfort and security surround the child. In the family where disharmony reigns this closeness can become claustrophobic. In such families extreme pressures resulting from socio-economic or emotional difficulties are translated into distortions in the interpersonal relationships between family members. The unfortunate child (or children) of such a family is socialized into accepting these distortions as normal patterns of behaviour. Such an individual's self-image develops on the basis of these distortions and he/she is likely, as an adult, to display the negative behaviour patterns

observed in the significant adults of childhood. It is for these reasons that the respite which the residential setting can provide is of such value, in temporarily, at least, removing the child from the scene of disharmony, allowing a period of reflection and calm, as well as exposure to adult behaviour of a more positive nature. Unquestionably, the socio-economic problems which are often related to such family difficulties must be the subject of intervention, but the child's immediate safety and long term development must be catered for also. The evils of society and internal family hostilities will not be resolved overnight; the time it takes to cure them, however, may consume a considerable portion of a young person's life: his/her childhood and adolescence.

Implicit in what has been so far said about respite is the idea that the residential school setting can, in certain circumstances, provide the child with a more positive living experience than the natural home. This begs the question: precisely what is the nature of the residential experience? This is the question which the following study attempts to answer. It will be shown that such schools can provide valuable experiences, important to their pupils' development, and absent in their previous life experience. Before we can turn our attention directly to this question, however, it is necessary to consider two other areas of the child's home environment which can be of negative influence.

(b) *School Problems*

The second situation from which pupils of this study feel residential schooling gives them respite, is that of school problems. These school problems are described in terms of institutional factors and interpersonal factors, with the majority of instances cited relating to the interpersonal relationships they experience with teachers in mainstream schools. It will be argued in this section that many of these "problems" can be shown to reflect widely recognized negative aspects of secondary schooling in Britain.

The following is a list of some of the recurrent complaints of pupils in the present study relating to the behaviour of their mainstream school teachers:

too formal in their behaviour towards pupils

too strict

"stuck up"

unfriendly

intolerant

humourless

uninterested in their pupils' personal welfare

not having time to take a personal interest in individual pupils

labelling some pupils with negative identities

treating some pupils unfairly

conducting boring lessons

offering insufficient help to pupils with learning difficulties.

Many pupils state that they had experienced difficulties in adjusting to the demands of school. They claimed that such difficulties had led to truancy and other forms of deviant behaviour. A composite of these pupils' perceptions of mainstream schools projects an image of such schools as: uncaring, rejecting places, which, ultimately, "chucked"/"threw"/"kicked" them out, or "sent"/"put" them away. Their experience of mainstream schooling has, more often than not, been a source of unhappiness and distress; their relationships with teachers -and sometimes other children- have been conflict-ridden and destructive to their self-esteem.

Writers in this field present sometimes conflicting socio-political explanations of what lies behind the institutional forms which have such damaging consequences, they all, however, share the view that some pupils may become marginalized in the education system as a result of their school experiences. When we consider the topic in such a broad context we realize that it is not only those pupils who are termed "maladjusted" or "EBD" whose experience is relevant to this discussion, but also the whole range of pupils who are deemed to have special educational needs (Tomlinson, 1982), as well as ethnic minority groups (eg. Coard, 1971), girls in schools (Davies, 1984; Mahoney, 1985), and pupils from working class backgrounds (Bourdieu, 1971; Levitas, 1974; Henderson, 1976; Squibb, 1978). It is suggested by these authors that each of these groups is particularly vulnerable to becoming marginalized from the mainstream educational experience, as a direct result of certain institutional forms which legitimize discriminatory attitudes. Other writers, such as Hemming (1980) and Schostak (1982; 1983), find a malaise in our secondary schools

which is a threat to the social, emotional and intellectual development of the vast majority of our children, and not only these named groups.

Without direct reference to any notable theoretical explorations of this topic, some of the early pioneer workers with 'maladjusted' children made some powerful and pertinent observations (anticipating much of the theoretical work) on the relationship between some of the accepted formalities of mainstream state schooling and the behavioural difficulties of some pupils. W. David Wills (1960) claims to have advised his teachers at Bodenham Manor to "behave exactly the opposite way from that in which most teachers behave in state schools" (p.135). Almost 50 years earlier A. S. Neill, in the first of his "Dominie" books (Neill, 1916), was describing his own attempts to defy the orthodoxies of the teaching profession prevalent in the early decades of this century:

Discipline, to me, means a pose on the part of the teacher. It makes him very remote; it lends him dignity. Dignity is a thing I abominate ... why should I be dignified before my bairns?
(p.17)

As Bridgeland (1971) points out, many of the pioneer workers with maladjusted children felt the need to abandon such orthodoxies in the interests of their pupils. This point is further emphasized by the fact that the vast majority of these pioneers came from non-teaching backgrounds, taking their models for practice from the field of psychology. Those who had been teachers, however, such as Neill and Lyward, were among the strongest advocates of non-compulsory classroom education, and the strongest opponents of traditional classroom practices.

When Wills (1960) is speaking of "respect" he is suggesting that teachers in state schools often only command "the outward appearance of respect" (p.135), by hiding behind a rigid wall of formality, such as the use of terms like "sir" and "miss", which merely give a superficial impression of the pupils' respect for the teacher. Wills goes on to argue that pupils should have respect for their teachers, but this respect should develop through the pupils' knowledge of the teacher as a "respectable" individual; that is: one worthy of respect. It follows from this line of argument, contrary to popular professional belief, that if pupils are to gain such knowledge of their teachers, the formal barriers which often separate pupil and teacher must be minimized:

I suggest that we cannot be respected if we are not known, and this is the precise contrary of the usual view - many people try to prevent the children knowing anything about them at all because they fear that if they are known they will not be respected. The man who presents himself to his class as the Teacher, the Whole Teacher, and Nothing But the Teacher is going exactly the wrong way about things. He has no private, personal life (so far as the child knows), no hopes, no fears, never needs to eat or go to the lavatory - above all, he has no weaknesses and never makes a mistake [...] such people make it impossible for the children to know them. And if he is not known, fully, as a man, in the round, it is very difficult for the child to have the real kind of respect for him that I am thinking of. (p.135)

In spite of the sexism of this passage, Wills is making a point which is still relevant at least 15 years later, when Marland offers the following advice to the "practising teacher":

In many ways it is lonely to be a teacher. Whatever happens, however you try, whatever intimacy you create, you will remain an adult and a teacher; your charges will remain young and pupils. It is tempting but a delusion to try to remove the barriers [...] There are suitable conventions of reticence. It may well be that you will occasionally want to reveal various details of your out-of-school life, but you should take care [...] once you break the normal boundary control there is no

reasonable way of re-establishing it when it suits you. The conventions of a certain school teacherly distance are not the creation of proud or cold people. Rather they are the practical necessities for human contact in a continuing *professional* relationship. (Marland, 1975, pp.22-23)

Wills's "the Teacher, the Whole Teacher, and Nothing But the Teacher" is here, alive and well. Marland uses a language of conflict. The emphasis is on the differences between pupils and teachers: differences which make the teacher inevitably "lonely". The loneliness is the price of self preservation: behind the "barriers", within the "boundaries" of teacher "reticence", which keep pupils at a safe "distance". Marland's book is indeed "A Survival Guide" for the battle ground of the classroom.

But, to what extent are pupil-teacher relations perceived to be conflict ridden? Some pupils in the present study describe intense conflict with mainstream teachers, but is such conflict in any sense representative of the experience of wider groups of pupils? Where this sense of conflict does exist (whether or not it is widespread in our schools), what are the causes and possible solutions to the problem?

Dierenfield's (1982) survey of the opinions of 465 English secondary school teachers' views of classroom disruption, provides some answers. It suggests that a large majority of teachers believe indiscipline in schools to be a serious problem, which is either remaining stable or worsening. The Elton Report (DES, 1989), describes the widely felt stress among teachers caused, by a "continuous stream" of minor acts of indiscipline, with which 97% of teachers, questioned in a survey commissioned for the report, claimed to meet on a weekly basis (53% daily). Preferred solutions to these difficulties, named in Dierenfield's report,

are: improvements in the quality of teachers; more effective control strategies; the early establishment of desirable behavioural standards, and greater support from head teachers and parents. A striking implication of Dierenfield's survey is that teachers see important remedies for disruption in their own hands; in terms of improvements in their own classroom performance. This view is shared not only by many writers on this subject with a sociological standpoint, but also with pupils who are the focus for these researchers. The Elton Committee (1989) echoes many of the remedies described in Dierenfield's survey, adding a recognition of the need for better training of teachers in dealing with problem behaviour, and placing a strong emphasis on the need of schools to offer their pupils morerewards for positive achievement, as a balance to the existing emphasis on punishment for bad behaviour. The need for schooling to be made a more satisfying experience for all pupils, is emphasised in the Elton Report.

Schostak (1982) noted a very high level of dissatisfaction among the pupils of the comprehensive school which he studied. In spite of the school's good reputation for scholastic achievement and community work, a staggering 95% of all of the pupils in the school criticized the school experience and questioned its value. Schostak traced a "progressively developing rejection of school", as the pupils passed from one year to the next. One indicator of this was the increase in truancy: in the third year 15% of pupils admitted to playing truant more than once; by the fifth year this had increased to 50%. The commonest reasons for truancy, given by 75% of truants, was "downright hatred of the school, lessons and teachers". Truancy is, however, only the "visible tip" of the problem.

Only 5% of the pupils expressed "unreserved enthusiasm" for school. The major problems identified by the pupils were:

boredom with lessons
examination pressure
poor staff-pupil relationships.

Pupils complained of not being allowed to act on their own initiative, and of being treated with disrespect by staff. Pupils complained particularly about staff use of public humiliation and bullying (verbal and physical) as control measures.

Dierenfield and Schostak show the two sides of the (apparent) divide: the teachers, with their concern for control and their fear of disruption; the pupils, with their boredom, sense of humiliation and desire for escape. It would seem, however, that school dissatisfaction among pupils derives from (in part at least) attempts to curb disruption which might well stem from such dissatisfaction. Once again, we are confronted with a circle of negativity. Of particular importance in Schostak's study is the fact that his sample is drawn from the full comprehensive range of pupils, and the dissatisfaction is as prevalent among the academic elite as it is among the less successful pupils.

Writers who have taken time to consider the nature of the school experience from the pupils' viewpoint, leave us with the overwhelming impression that for many pupils much of what takes place in schools is neither pleasant nor enriching, and for many pupils schooling is a negative

experience. Silberman (1970), in his study of American schools, describes them as "grim, and joyless places", and he believes them to be responsible for the "mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self" (p.10). Ten years later we find Hemming (1980) making strikingly similar claims about about English secondary education, which, he suggests creates "hobbled minds" by providing a curriculum and organizational form which leaves pupils with a sense of the irrelevance of schooling to their lives. This failure of the schools to relate to the pupils' real lives leads to the pupils being involved in their schooling in only a limited and often grudging way.

Hemming focuses, in his analysis of this situation, on the "academic" emphasis of the curriculum, which, he argues, is based on Descarte's "over evaluation of the intellect" (p.4) and the devaluation of the emotional and intuitive areas of human development. Silberman (1970) centres his argument on the patterns of social organization and interaction in American schools. He argues that the most important prerequisite for success in the American school system is docility. American schools, he claims, are preoccupied with problems of order and control to the extent that pupils are constantly required to be silent and immobile. Silberman also notes a "slavish adherence to routine". In addition to this almost all formal learning in school is initiated by the teacher. The result of these experiences, says Silberman, is to instil in the pupils the belief that their own desires, interests and purposes are inconsequential. The only legitimate pupil response is one of slavish conformity to the dictates of the school authorities. For pupils to succeed in such a system it becomes increasingly necessary for them to rely upon the evaluations,

desires and wishes of their teachers. The ultimate in educational success comes from the assimilation of these imposed values. This latter effect is achieved, principally, through the heavy stress which the schools place on students' course grades and examination results. Un-conforming pupils are labelled failures or deviant and are thus marginalized from the mainstream educational process.

Both Silberman and Hemming describe education systems which not only fail to promote the development of lively, inquiring minds, but also have a negative, and at worst crippling, effect on the personal development of pupils. Personal expression is stifled, according to Silberman, by the regimentation and formalism of school life, and, according to Hemming, by the low status position occupied by the emotional and expressive areas of human experience within the formal curriculum. In both cases pupils are subjugated by an oppressive hierarchy, and are only valued in relation to a narrow range of achievements which bear little or no relation to their personal lives or interests. The view that some aspects of formal schooling may contribute to the disenchantment, unhappiness and disaffection of many school students has been a growing area of concern among many eminent researchers concerned with British state education since the 1960's, and it is to a consideration of this body of work that we now turn.

Hargreaves (1967), in his seminal study of "Lumley" secondary modern school, shows how the traditional academic values of the English secondary school leaves the academic low achievers with little or no opportunity for obtaining legitimate rewards within the formal school

system. The only possibilities open to such pupils for high status lie within the peer group, the values of which are anti-school - since to accept school values is to accept low status - and delinquent. Willis (1978) follows a similar theme to Hargreaves: the exploration of the relationship between the school system and a deviant sub group. Willis, like Hargreaves demonstrates the direct conflict which exists between the values and norms of the sub group ("the lads") and the officially acknowledged school values. "The lads" aspire to a "shop floor culture" of their neighbourhood, born out of the harsh physical conditions of factory work, as well as the social and economic pressures of low paid insecure work. Here high status is achieved through the display of a particular brand of machismo. Prescribed forms of behaviour, in this culture, are anti-authority, non-academic, and highly physical, with a stress on immediate as opposed to deferred gratification.

The ten years separating the work of Hargreaves and Willis seem to have witnessed little change in the daily experiences of many school students. The major differences between the two pieces of research rests in the analyses rather than the findings. Hargreaves seeks solutions to the problems of disaffection in improvements to the institutional organization of the school. Willis, on the other hand, sees the school and "the lads" as representing opposing class interests which are determined by the economic inequalities which form the necessary basis of a capitalist society. The "the lads" and the school are trapped in a cycle of cultural reproduction which can only be broken by a radical shift in the balance of power which presently reflects a middle class hegemony. For Willis, therefore, the institutional structures of social institutions, such as

schools, are not amenable to the type of change proposed by Hargreaves, since efforts towards such change would be seen to represent a challenge to the status quo. The important, less debatable, shared outcome of both studies, of particular interest to the present writer, is the demonstration of the way in which schools can be seen to actively participate in the marginalization of certain pupils failing to offer such pupils experiences which the pupils find rewarding, and by offering instead experiences which are found by the pupils to be humiliating and degrading.

Moving forward to the 1980's we find Schostak (1982 and 1983) adding his voice to this debate. We have already noted some of Schostak's initial remarks on the negative feelings pupils from across the ability spectrum in a comprehensive school express about their school experiences (Schostak, 1982). Schostak (1983) follows these initial observations with a more detailed study, in which he presents views which bear close similarities with those expressed by both Silberman and Hemming when he states:

... schools, in being primarily agents of social control, tend to define individuality in terms of deviance and further set the conditions for the production of deviance.
(Schostak, 1983, pp.5-6)

Schostak, like Silberman, stresses the fact that schools are generally designed and organized in such a way that demands a high degree of uniformity in pupil behaviour. Assertion of individuality becomes an act of deviance. Teachers are detached from pupils and tend to be judgemental toward pupils. The impossibility, implied by such teacher behaviour, of



pupils being able to form personal attachments with teachers, who are of course highly "significant others", forces the pupils to seek personal recognition from the peer group. Sub groups, therefore, form of the type described by Hargreaves (1967); these can be pro or anti school, depending on how rewarding individuals find the school experience. Teachers, Schostak declares, have the power to confer or withhold rewards. The social distance which exists between staff and their pupils both fosters and perpetuates insensitivity on the part of teachers in their handling of pupils. This insensitivity is enacted in, among other ways, the highly destructive use of sarcasm by some teachers towards pupils, which can lead to feelings of humiliation and the internalization of low self images among pupils. This social distance, which many teachers feel to be necessary for their personal preservation as well as the correct execution of their role as objective, impartial judge, tends to lead teachers to see pupils in abstracted, objectified terms, and thus to neglect their personal human needs and rights (cf. Marland, 1975).

Schostak suggests that the atmosphere of alienation which develops from these circumstances, and the constant danger faced by pupils of emotional damage, which emanates from the same source, leads to the adoption of one or more self-defensive strategies, which in themselves contribute further to a hostile and competitive atmosphere among pupils. The first strategy is "becoming like others", this involves adopting the mannerisms and values of a sub group in order to gain acceptance by that group. As we have already noted, the values of such groups in relation to official school values may vary with the degree to which the pupil gains formal school success. Secondly, the strategy of "manipulating others" can

provide a useful means of protecting or building one's image in the eyes of others. Thirdly, "deceiving others" can be used to achieve a similar end. These strategies are each concerned with engineering a particular public image for oneself as a means of protecting or hiding any potentially vulnerable inner reality. The fourth strategy of "avoiding others" is often the final defensive measure adopted when the other three have failed, and it is the most difficult to sustain in a school situation, which is characterized by constant supervision, group monitoring and assessment, and communality.

Each of these strategies is in essence defensive and at the same time a further denial of the pupil's individuality. Paradoxically, these defensive strategies which occur in response to an inhuman control system make the pupils more controllable, since the stereotypical forms of behaviour they generate are easily identified, predictable and thus amenable to formulaic responses. In the search for an acceptable and manageable identity pupils willingly embrace impersonal labels such as "bright", "thick", "cheeky", "disruptive" etc., since such labels, whilst excluding them from certain groups, locate them within particular social groups, and save them from the ultimate social failure of isolation. An alternative to these strategies, which may result from a failure to successfully execute these measures, is what Schostak terms the "violent solution". The use of physical violence is interpreted by Schostak as a response to the repressive social structure which has been outlined. Such a solution may be employed by the individual who is alienated from his/her peers to the extent that other individuals come to be perceived by him/her as non human objects upon whom impersonal violence can be inflicted.

Schostak's research begins to shed light on the nature of the school experience as it is perceived by the consumers of schooling: the pupils. The focus of the pupils' perceptions is on the manner in which they are treated by their teachers. And it is this concern which repeatedly comes to the fore in research in this area; repeatedly pupils are heard to complain that they are not treated with respect and consideration by their teachers. Tattum (1982), in his interview study of disruptive pupils in schools and special units, identified 5 categories in the pupils' perceptions of the motivation for their disruptive behaviour in schools ("vocabularies of motive"). These are:

1. It was the teacher's fault.
2. Being treated with disrespect (by the teacher).
3. Inconsistency of rule application (by the teacher).
4. We were only messing about - having a laugh.
5. It's the fault of the school system.

The striking thing about Tattum's findings is that four out of the five categories refer to teacher pupil-relationships. Central to the concerns expressed in the first three categories is the teacher's failure to appreciate the way in which certain forms of teacher behaviour will be perceived by pupils. The fourth response appears to indicate the teacher's failure to appreciate the significance of pupil behaviour. All five categories indicate that pupils view their own behaviour as being a rational and appropriate response to a given situation, in that they become bored and easily distracted in uninteresting and poorly organized lessons; they openly display displeasure or retaliate when treated disrespectfully; they complain when a rule is invoked selectively; they respond to the

humour they perceive in certain situations; they (like teachers) work more effectively at particular types of tasks at different times of the day or the week. These pupils then come to see spontaneity and naturalness in their behaviour as unacceptable in the eyes of their teachers. And whilst, as we have already suggested, many pupils conform to these imposed standards of affective self denial in return for the rewards they receive in the instrumental sphere (academic honours etc.), other pupils, for whom such rewards are either unattainable or irrelevant, have nothing to gain from such acceptance, may openly challenge that which threatens their self esteem and seek alternative sources of positive status (Hargreaves, 1967). This latter group might even find acceptance of such rewards to be in conflict with the cultural values they bring from their working class homes (Willis, 1978).

Rosser and Harré (1976), in their study of comprehensive school pupils' perceptions of classroom "trouble", suggest that much pupil misbehaviour can be seen in terms of "retribution", which is exacted by pupils in return for the perceived failings of their teachers. These offences resemble very closely the categories identified by Tattum (1982); they are:

1. Boring teachers.
2. Teachers being contemptuous of pupils; treating them as children.
3. Incompetent, time serving teachers.
4. Teachers who treat pupils as anonymous, non-individuals.
5. Teachers who are incompetent or weak.
6. Teachers who are rude to pupils.

7. Teachers who are unfair in their treatment of pupils.

Rosser and Harré suggest that pupils are affronted by these types of teacher behaviour, chiefly because these forms of behaviour threaten the pupils' self esteem, either directly, through the teacher's lack of respect for the pupil, or indirectly, through the teacher's perceived weakness, which may lead the pupil to believe that compliance with the demands of a weak individual indicates even greater weakness in the one who shows compliance. The "principles of retribution" identified by the authors are employed by the pupils to restore their threatened self esteem. Rosser and Harré describe two categories of principles: principles of "reciprocity" and principles of "equilibration" (p.175). "Reciprocity" involves returning like for like: slap for slap, insult for insult. "Equilibration" involves behaviour designed to "restore themselves as human beings" (p.176), after having had their self esteem damaged. This self assertion can take the form of provocative behaviour designed to irritate the offender or a form of withdrawal, such as truancy, "injured or strategic silence" (p.176).

One of the most common, and perhaps powerful, forms of "equilibration" is laughter, and as such it deserves particular attention. The use of laughter in conflict situations in schools has been noted in the present writer's study and by many other researchers (Woods, 1976; Willis, 1978; Davies, 1984; Schostak, 1982). Woods (1976) suggests that pupil laughter can be seen as:

... a reaction against authority and routine, a socially divisive and disturbing element made in the interests of the preservation of one group and the destruction of the other. (p.178)

Woods also notes:

... the importance pupils of all abilities attached to teachers being able to share a joke and have a laugh with them. During such incidents, teacher and pupil were seen to transcend the institution and become human. (p.178)

What is clear, however, from research discussed so far, is that all too often pupils see their teachers as inhuman and humourless. There is very little shared laughter between pupils and teachers. Humour, in fact, is more often used as a classroom weapon, either through the teacher's use of sarcasm or the pupil's use of "subversive irony" (Woods, 1984). In this way humour comes to exemplify the distortive nature of some forms of schooling: the tool (laughter) which is potentially a means of binding individuals (staff and pupils) in a mutually rewarding situation becomes an offensive and defensive weapon, which threatens to dehumanize rather than harmonize.

It must be again stressed that much of the research so far considered is concerned with the perceptions of a wide range of school pupils and not simply those who might be termed "disruptive". It would seem to be the case that a great number of apparently well adjusted and successful pupils suffer these negative aspects of schooling. This point is made by Schostak (1982 and 1983). Reid (1985), in his study^{of} truancy and absenteeism from schools in England and Wales, encounters similarly widespread dissatisfaction among the pupils in his study, and finds such dissatisfaction often cited as being a motivation for truancy. In common with many of the other studies so far cited, Reid finds that habitual

truants often perceive teachers as hostile and authoritarian in their dealings with pupils. He also reports that many good attenders from the same classes as habitual truants were equally or more alienated from school and teachers than the truants. Reid's explanation for this is that the good attenders attend school "for compensatory social (peer group friendships, mutual activity), rather than good educational reasons" (p.83). This is born out by the fact Reid reports finding many truants to be socially isolated and unpopular with their peers. Furthermore, such pupils tend to come from poor, unsupportive home backgrounds, have psychological or behavioural problems, low I.Q's and learning and adjustment difficulties in school. Thus it would seem that the most disadvantaged pupils, in terms of broader social, economic and educational factors, find school least rewarding. This point is further underlined by the fact that the absentees of Reid's study tend to hold extremely unfavourable perceptions of their teachers, to the extent that Reid reports: "teachers emerge as crucial factors in the cognitive processes of the absentees" (p.103). This is a particularly disturbing picture when we consider the pastoral role of the school:

... these data tend to highlight the poorer personal relationships which exist between persistent absentees and their parents and teachers as compared with good attenders. This is a pathetic situation as absentees and truants are the very people who tend to need help most, indeed, the very pupils for whom pastoral care teams and counsellors were first introduced into schools. (p.102)

The fact is that the climate of hostility and conflict which appears to prevail in some schools makes teachers the very last people to whom pupils (particularly the most disadvantaged) will go for counselling or to share a confidence.

We have already noted the shortcomings which pupils perceive in their teachers, Reid presents the following comprehensive list of the most sought after (but rarely experienced) teacher qualities, as defined by pupils from across the full spectrum of age and ability in the schools studied:

1. Teachers should be strict but fair.
2. Teachers should give pupils individual attention.
3. Teachers should be able to help pupils with their personal problems and needs.
4. Teachers should have a sense of humour and be understanding in their dealings with pupils.
5. Teachers should be able to give pupils who need it academic remedial help.

As we have seen, the image of teachers generally held by pupils falls far short of these standards.

When we weigh up the wealth of evidence that has been presented here, and consider the picture of some pupils' experience of comprehensive schooling which emerges from this, we begin to see truancy and other forms of school deviance as a rational response to an intolerable situation; it is, as Schostak (1983) has suggested, perhaps some schools rather than their pupils that most deserve to be labelled "maladjusted". These perceptions give added impetus to what Hargreaves (1982) has noted as major challenges facing the comprehensive school of the 1980's: to find ways of involving all their pupils in the mainstream life of the school, and to find ways of contributing to the development of positive self images for

all their pupils, instead of crushing and denying pupils' individuality and spontaneity.

This account of the negative qualities of some schools and the disasterously poor quality of staff-pupil relationships, must be disturbing to anyone concerned with education in schools. It is, however, important to take account of some of the possible remedies that have been profered in response to this situation. At the root of the difficulties, that have been highlighted above, are sets of particular attitudes and assumptions; on the basis of these attitudes and assumptions are built the structures and organizational procedures which influence, to a large degree, the behaviour of the participants in the school situation.

Research by Denscombe (1985) into the phenomenon of classroom control, leads him to conclude that disruptive behaviour in classrooms is less usefully seen, from a sociological perspective, in terms of a rejection of class hegemony by working class pupils (as Willis's 1978 analysis suggests), than as a pupil response to "parochial, practical factors that operate at a routine level within the institution of the school" (p.7). Such factors include: architecture, timetables and lesson topics. Denscombe suggests that these factors are not necessarily subject to ideological controls, but are, to a considerable extent under the control of individual schools and, to a lesser extent, individual teachers. Denscombe's argument is not taken as a complete refutation of the notion that schools are subject to external ideological controls, but it is chosen to demonstrate the possibilities for self determination which are claimed to exist for schools within a given ideological climate. In this way

Denscombe's work shares much in common with that of Reynolds and Sullivan (1979) and Rutter et al. (1979), which will be dealt with later.

Denscombe identifies two contrasting versions of "what the teacher ought to be doing", these are referred to as the "traditional" and the "progressive" pedagogies. In essence, the traditional approach is authoritarian in attitude to teaching and control, and it corresponds closely to the school settings described by Schostak (1983) and Hargreaves (1967). The progressive approach, on the other hand, is non authoritarian and stresses the democratic involvement of pupils. Teachers are seen more as facilitators of learning rather than instructors; they set the conditions for learning rather than direct pupils. An assumption underpinning the progressive approach is that pupils are inherently inquisitive and have a natural enthusiasm for the acquisition of knowledge. The traditionalists, however, assume pupils to be inherently indisciplined and intractable, and for these teachers control precedes teaching. For the progressives pupil compliance derives from a stimulating educational experience.

We are already familiar with pupils' perceptions of the traditional approach, in which teachers are seen as distant cold and threatening. Denscombe reports that in the course of his research he noted that whilst many beginning teachers entered the profession -fresh from college- with progressive ideals, many of these very quickly shifted from the permissive approach to the custodial attitudes of the traditionalists. Denscombe accounts for this shift in attitude in terms of three possible factors: firstly, student teachers are required to profess progressive

values in order to pass examinations in college; secondly, their own successful experience of secondary education has more than likely been in a traditional setting; thirdly, once in a school the new teacher falls under the influence of traditional teachers whose role is, in part, to judge the newcomer's professional competence. In spite of this, however, Denscombe observes many progressive survivors.

The loneliness of the teacher, which Marland (1975) believes to be inherent in the very nature of teaching, can be seen as a feature of the traditional approach, in which both schools and classrooms are "closed" (Denscombe, 1985). In the "closed" classroom there is one teacher and one group of pupils. Other teachers and other pupils may enter the room only with the permission of the presiding teacher. More often than not, Denscombe points out, judgements about what goes on inside classrooms are based on superficial details, with noise level being considered to be of particular significance. This leads to such erroneous assumptions as the quiet classroom is a well ordered and, therefore, educationally successful setting. The open classroom, by contrast, which is the preferred setting for the progressive teacher, demands a breaking down of all such boundaries. Here the stress on non-authoritarian relationships allows for noise and action to be legitimately initiated by pupils as well as teachers. Subject boundaries in this setting will be blurred, with teachers performing the role of catalyst in the pupils' learning processes, and all participants moving freely between different activities, and different groups of adults and pupils. There is clearly a tension between the progressive and traditional approaches, with the weight of established tradition being difficult to shift. That progressive approaches can

prevail, and can produce arguably superior educational and social outcomes to traditional approaches, is an area to which we now turn.

Research by Reynolds and Sullivan (1979), Reynolds (1976; 1984) and Rutter et al. (1979) has been presented as evidence for the effects of different forms of school organization on levels of pupils deviance. Reynolds and Sullivan (1979) identify two types of school organization: the "co-optive" and the "coercive". These forms correspond, respectively, with Denscombe's progressive and traditional types. Co-optive schools, as their name suggests, stress good staff-pupil relationships, in which pupils are treated with respect and trust. Pupils in such schools are also encouraged to become involved in the day to day decision making which forms an essential part of the running of the school and its general social organization. Common in such schools will be staff-pupil liaison committees and prefect systems. Prefects will not only be drawn from groups of academic high flyers; a major feature of such schools is the heavy stress which is placed on non-academic as well as academic achievement. This effort to cater for the wide ranging, and at times, disparate needs of pupils across the full range of the school's intake is justified in terms of a democratic ideology, which stresses the right of all participants in the school community to be heard. In many ways the co-optive school is the complete antithesis of the coercive school, which is characterized by an authoritarian regime where pupil compliance is elicited through the threat and performance of coercive measures in an inflexibly rule bound and often threatening atmosphere. The co-optive school, then, is defined by the conception of the school organization as a community which is shared by staff and pupils, and which values social harmony. The

coercive school is best likened to a custodial institution, where order and pupil conformity are primary goals; here conflicts are resolved by the invocation of rules.

Rutter et al. (1979) stress the importance of school "ethos", in their study of the effects of secondary schools on pupils. Rutter claims, on the basis of research carried out in a range of urban comprehensive schools, that behavioural and academic outcomes are best in schools which stress good staff-pupil relationships and academic excellence. Schools which have relatively low expectations of their pupils, in academic and behavioural terms were found to have poorer levels of academic attainment and behaviour problems, including truancy.

Gillham (1981) illustrates, through a collection of essays, the value of a "systems" approach to the problems of disruptive behaviour in schools. In common with Rutter, Denscombe, and Reynolds and Sullivan, he shows how organizational patterns within schools and education authorities, which take account of the effects of interrelating facets of pupils' lives, can prevent disruption from occurring. The solutions offered stress a shift away from individualized perceptions of disruptive behaviour, which seek cause and remedy in the disruptive individual, towards a conception of disruptive behaviour as being related to the interaction which goes on between individuals and the social and physical environment in which the individual operates. This view leads to preventive approaches to disruption which may include (for example) social work intervention in the family (Tutt, 1981) or restructuring the school day (Hastings, 1981), and adds further weight to the arguments offered by Rutter et al., and

Reynolds and Sullivan, that school organization and ethos can have a major impact on pupil behaviour.

If the way in which schools are organized is the result of any kind of consensus then it must be accepted that at the root of such organization lie the attitudes of individuals. Hargreaves et al. (1975), Keddie (1971) and Sharp and Green (1975), show how the assumptions held by individual teachers can influence the experiences of pupils in their classrooms. Hargreaves shows that teachers can develop highly detailed images of pupils on the basis of scant knowledge of the individuals concerned. Teachers he observed were more inclined to define pupils as "deviant", regardless of the pupil's behaviour, if the child was so defined by other staff, or if the child had "deviant" siblings; or on the basis of other extraneous information. In this way pupils could become "labelled" as deviant regardless of their actual behaviour. Hargreaves also found that different teachers, as a result of their different approaches to pupils, experienced different manifestations of deviant pupil behaviour. Certain teachers were defined as "deviant provocative", whilst others were defined as "deviance insulative". The former type of teacher created conditions which were conducive to pupil deviance, whilst the latter had a style of management which tended to discourage deviance. Keddie (1971) showed that teachers developed assumptions about the intellectual competence and motivation level of pupils on the basis of their stream placement. Thus, even though teachers were supposed to be teaching an undifferentiated course to all streams in a particular year, they actually prepared different "levels" of work for the different streams and used differentiated teaching style. A striking example of the degree of

differentiation was provided by the fact that certain oral questions, when asked by 'C' stream pupils were treated as insolence or time wasting; but were dealt with seriously when the same question was asked by an 'A' pupil. Finally, Sharp and Green (1975), showed that staff in a primary school related better to and were more helpful toward pupils who shared their own middle class cognitive styles. The teachers tended to view the free explorations of working class children as less worthwhile than those of middle class children, because they lacked an understanding of the working class culture from which many of their pupils came. They were, therefore, less able to promote meaningful discovery work with the working class children than with the middle class children.

To conclude this section it must be emphasized that the perceptions presented by the pupils in this study of their comprehensive school experience are by no means unique. Nor are such perceptions limited to pupils in the margins of education. There is a wealth of evidence to suggest that many, if not most, pupils in schools feel demeaned and insulted by their experiences, and feel great dissatisfaction with the quality of staff pupil relationships. It has also been shown, however, that this state of affairs is not an inevitability. Schools need not be alienating dehumanizing places. The fact that many of them are perceived as such by their pupils is perhaps the justification for the need which many pupils seem to have for "respite" from them. The fact that schools can operate on more humane and caring principles is perhaps why another form of school (such as the residential special school) may successfully provide that respite.

(c) *Peer Group Problems*

The third area of major concern, identified by pupils from both of the schools studied, is that of the home based peer group. It was not uncommon, for pupils from both schools, to express dissatisfaction with their enforced separation from former peers, and the gradual decline in the perceived strength of the affiliation between the interviewees and their former home based friends, which often seemed to follow such separation. It was also recognized, by many of the subjects who expressed this dissatisfaction, that such separation had the positive effect of keeping them out of trouble. They expressed the belief that continued association with former peers could have led to acts of delinquency which would have resulted in criminal proceedings. The residential school, for these pupils, provided them with a life line away from a life of crime and probable penal detention.

The importance of the peer group in adolescent life is massive. Willmott (1966), in his study of adolescent boys in East London, describes the informal peer group as "a central point of adolescence" (p.36), and goes on to say:

[...] the male peer group is a crucial social unit in the lives of adolescent boys. (p.42)

As Hoghughie (1983) states;

[...] It is a simple and not very remarkable fact that most

people like other people's company. Youngsters are no different. By being in company, they feel valued and can, in turn, bestow value as their fellows. (p.118).

Wilmott, however, draws attention to the particular twilight nature of adolescence, with its status confusions and perceived deprivations.

[...] The adolescent boy can enjoy a freedom and equality he cannot find at school, at work or inside his family. This sense of fraternity is often mentioned [by the boys in Wilmott's study]. (p.40).

The implication of research seems to be that for most children, and especially those who may be termed delinquent or socially deviant, the peer group is, of the three major sources of social influence, the only one which provides primarily rewarding experiences. We have already witnessed, in the two preceding sections, the extent to which the family and the school so often become sources of deprivation and rejection; situations which can lead children to adopt a defensive stance.

According to Hoghughi (1983), adolescents (in common with adults) derive the following rewards from peer group membership;

fellowship

security

status

protection

identity

stimulation

When we compare this list of rewards with Pringle's (1975) list of the psychological needs of all children, for:

love and security
new experiences
praise and recognition
responsibility

We find the match to be very good:

love and security	:	fellowship security/protection
new experiences	:	stimulation
praise and recognition	:	status
responsibility	:	identity

Explanations as to why acts of delinquency, and other forms of social deviance, come to form valued parts in some groups' repertoire of activities vary, but they share an acknowledgement of some or all of the needs and rewards that are outlined above.

Acts of juvenile delinquency are, overwhelmingly, performed by groups of juveniles (Hoghugh, 1983; Rutter and Giller, 1983). Similarly, much disruptive behaviour in schools can be seen in the context of a social group. Hargreaves (1967) and Wills (1978) show how individuals' acts of disruption can be analyzed in terms of the values and norms of the

subculture to which the pupils belong. Hargreaves sees this subculture as emanating from its members' response to the unrewarding and downright degrading experiences which a school inflicts upon some of its pupils. Willis, however, sees this subculture in terms of social class differences. The pupils of his study, he suggests, are disruptive because they behave in accordance with the values and norms of the working class "shop floor culture" of their families and neighbourhood. School simply offers such children an irrelevant set of values and norms which in no sense prepare them for the working class adult lives to which they aspire. Coulby (1987) pursues a similar line of argument to that by Willis, but he stresses much more strongly the role of the school in denying and denegrating working class culture:

The present stratification of the curriculum and the whole notion of society and intelligence work against working-class pupils in that they are perceived to underachieve by not learning middle-class knowledge and values. If the knowledge taught paid adequate respect to working-class culture and experience, there would be far less likelihood of working-class pupils failing to come to grips with it. (170).

Rutter et al. (1979) also point to some of the ways in which some schools may contribute to the formation of pupil peer groups which may operate in opposition to the professed aims of the school. On the basis of an extensive longitudinal study of pupils and schools in London, Rutter et al. were led to the following conclusion:

For children who are unlikely to gain any examination passes there may be few advantages in being part of an institution in which one of the explicit objectives is academic success and in which the norm is scholastic commitment. If the intake to any school consists of a very high proportion of less able children there will be an increased tendency for the formation of non-academic social groups

indifferent or opposed to academic success. (pp.201-2).

Rutter et al. go on to point out that such groups increase the potential for teacher-pupil conflict and, furthermore, place social pressure on newcomers to the school to join the anti-school group. As we have already observed, the peer group offers attractive incentives to members and potential members, in the form of emotional and psychological rewards.

A useful means of understanding the mechanisms which can lead to the development of the delinquent peer group, is to see such deviance in terms of problem solving strategies. Hughes et al. (1971) make this point:

Subcultures (of which student cultures are one example) develop best where a number of people are faced with common problems and interact both intensively and extensively in an effort to find solutions for them, where people who face the same contingencies and exigencies in everyday life have an opportunity to deal with them communally. (p.51).

The central problem faced by many pupils who become disruptive in school is that their underlying emotional and psychological needs are not met when they conform to the official expectations of the school. Schostak (1983), makes the point, as we have already noted, that schooling is a negative experience for many pupils. Academically successful pupils, however, often accept the insults, boredom and humiliation (Schostak, 1982) inflicted on them by teachers, in return for the academic credentials which schools have the power to award. Thus, to some limited extent, such pupils' status and recognition needs are served. As Coulby (1987) stresses, however, there are still many pupils for whom such rewards remain

unattainable, and it is for these pupils that the fulfilment of fundamental emotional and psychological needs becomes most problematic.

The group nature of disruptive behaviour in schools is partly attributable to the official organization of schools and the ways in which many teachers are reported to behave. Throughout their schooling pupils are dealt with, for both teaching, administrative and recreational purposes, in public groups. An exception to this general rule is, of course, the deviant pupil who refuses to conform to officially prescribed forms of behaviour, and, thus comes into the province of the pastoral care staff (Schostak, 1987). That individuality among school pupils is officially frowned upon (Schostak, 1983) is underlined by the fact that withdrawal from the public arena is often the response to some perceived failing in the school machine.

When we consider work by Tattum (1982) and Rosser and Harre (1976) on pupils' explanations of the causes of disruptive behaviour, we find the group nature of much of what goes on in schools as a significant feature of these explanations. Disruptive pupils, from both studies, complained about teachers who failed to maintain order in the classroom, who publicly humiliated pupils, by treating them as children, or with personal disrespect; teachers who were publicly rude to pupils, and teachers who openly favoured some pupils above others, when it came to the application of rules. These "offences" were either against individual pupils in public settings, or against whole groups of pupils. In each case the degradation, humiliation or insult is enacted before groups of peers. Both the individual and the group to which he belongs now have the problem

of reconciling the image of self implied by this form of treatment with the image which the individual has of himself and that which the group has of him. This begins to explain why much of the deviance which follows such "offences" can be seen as an attempt by the pupil to re-establish "equilibrium" through "reciprocity" (Rosser and Harre, 1976). The pupil (or group of pupils) return this challenge to their desired image with a like challenge. Put crudely, the aggrieved pupil neutralizes the effect of the threat by showing his disdain for the challenger: he refuses to recognise the right of the teacher/school to make such a judgement. For this reason much disruptive behaviour is similarly public in its enactment. This can be seen from Tattum's (1982) adaptation of the Pack Report's (SED, 1977) categorization of disruptive behaviour. The report locates its list of disruptive behaviour in six spheres of social interactions.

- (a) Pupils and authority: Lateness, absenteeism, truancy, general non-compliance with school rules.
- (b) Pupils and work: Refusal to do homework, blatant opposition to projected work.
- (c) Pupil and Teacher: Use of abusive and foul language, persistent interruption of teacher, refusal to comply with instructions, disruption of the teaching situation.
- (d) Pupil and Pupil: Bullying, intimidation, violent assault, extortion, theft.
- (e) Pupil and property: Lack of care for and abuse of school books, equipment and premises (vandalism).
- (f) Pupil and public: Offences against private property and public facilities.

(Based on Tattum, 1982, p.16)

Categories a, b, c, and e, given the general pattern of organization in schools, comprise of essentially public acts. These acts directly

undermine the rule governed school system (Hargreaves et al., 1975; Tattum, 1982) and challenge the teacher's/school's right to impose such rules, in a very public manner. Such public self assertion can both establish and sustain an individual's position of status within the anti-school peer group. It is also interesting to note here the way in which categories d and f begin to show a degree of overlap between school indiscipline and legally punishable delinquency. This observation points us to the very important argument that the anti school sub-group does not exist in a vacuum. It's values and norms do not solely derive from the experience of schooling.

We have already seen how the school can influence a pupil's degree of adjustment, and how fulfilment of the child's psychological and emotional needs can be inhibited by the school, thus enhancing the influence of the peer group. Hoghughi (1983) also points to the influence of the pupil's home background. He suggests that a deprived home environment can make young persons feel a greater need for the emotional attachments that can be provided by peers. As Reid (1987) suggests, economically deprived families may suffer a level of emotional stress which interferes with the quality of the interpersonal relationships in the family; particularly the quality of parenting. The chaos and overcrowding, the lack of obvious parental interest and supervision, make the peer group an attractive proposition to the child, and, furthermore, present little opposition to its influence.

Hoghughi suggests that the anti-social activities of some groups of adolescents occur in response to the lack of legitimate sources of

stimulation available in deprived areas. The crucial factor here is parental influence. Hoghughi (1983) and Rutter and Giller (1983) suggest that when parents take an active interest in their children's peer group activities, they can be successful in dissuading or preventing their children from joining delinquent groups. Once the individual comes under the influence of the delinquent peer group, it becomes difficult for him to extricate himself, as Hoghughi suggests:

The normal group processes, such as dominance and persuasion come into play. The risks are minimized and the rewards, both material and in terms of fun and excitement exaggerated. (p.122).

The group influence is even more powerful if the individual has little or no alternative source of positive interpersonal contact:

For some, the reinforcements are so great and the price they have to pay so small (in their estimation) that the offending takes on a purposive role and becomes almost a career. (p.122).

These "reinforcements" often include the "group complicity ..., mutual giving of courage and support", upon which the successful execution of an act of group delinquency can depend. The means become the reward, which thus:

...reinforces not only the group bond but also the original anti social act and makes repetition more likely.
(p.122).

The argument so far presented then begins to show how potent a combination social deprivation in the home environment and negative experiences in school can be, in the generation of group delinquency. This

point is clearly underlined by West and Farrington (1973), who identified five factors which are strongly linked with juvenile delinquency:

- low socio-economic status
- large family size
- parental delinquency
- poor child rearing practices
- poor scholastic attainment

The peer group, for individuals suffering from these deprivations, becomes a haven, where the individual's fundamental needs for approval, acceptance, status and stimulation can be found. The less the opportunities for such rewards in the other major spheres of the individual's life (ie; the family and school) the greater the potential influence of the peer group. However, as the present study will show, delinquent adolescents, whilst accepting the rewards of the peer group, may still be aware of the long term dangers and undesirability of a delinquent career. The conflict which ensues from such an awareness can often only be resolved by the realization of their fears, such as a custodial sentence or the removal of the individual to some form of residential facility. It would seem that the rational knowledge of the dangers of delinquency is less potent than the emotional and psychological rewards that can be derived from membership of the delinquent group.

Rutter and Giller (1983) quote studies which suggest that:

[...] disengagement from the influence of peer groups was an important feature in the abandonment of delinquent habits.
(p.226).

This is true when the disengagement is voluntary and involuntary. They also note that marriage, obtaining regular work and moving to a new residential district are associated with a decrease in delinquency. Hoghughi (1983) echoes these findings. Both Hoghughi and Rutter and Giller emphasise greatly the role of the parents in directing their children away from delinquent groups and towards groups which follow more socially acceptable aims, as Hoghughi states:

The chief aim should be to create a sense of affiliation, commitment and responsibility to the group which is likely to impede drift into delinquency. (p.124).

Marriage and work can help to do this, simply by making less time available for mixing with peers, (Willmott, 1966). Holman (1981) describes how a community based youth project, which concentrated on attracting young delinquents to community clubs had a similar, if somewhat limited, effect, simply through offering youngsters an alternative to delinquency in the form of non-delinquent activities which the youths themselves defined as attractive.

Clearly, then, the alternative to a delinquent career is not simply referral to a residential school. Inroads into this problem could be made by community based projects, aimed at providing support for distressed families, and improvements to social and youth facilities. Schools also can play their part by finding ways of incorporating disaffected pupils more effectively into the mainstream life of the school. Where such initiatives are not underway, however, the influence of the delinquent peer group may be too powerful to resist. In such circumstances

the residential school may provide that necessary period of respite from such influences, during which time the individual can gain experience of positive relationships with both peers and adults that are not linked to the pursuit of delinquency, and learn that the preservation of self-esteem is not inextricably linked to being deviant.

Conclusion

The following sections of this thesis will attempt to provide an exploration and analysis of the pupils' experience of residential schooling. This is an important area of consideration because the notion of respite, as it has been outlined above, implies that the residential setting, as experienced by pupils in this study, offers a living experience which differs in important ways from the network of social contacts which are significant in their "home" lives. We must ascertain the quality of these new experiences, and attempt to assess the value of such experiences to the individuals involved.

The following study, whilst being of an essentially interactionist nature, makes use of a wide range of references including some of those representing positivistic and psychodynamic theoretical positions. It is an assumption underlying this study, and one demonstrated in the preceding three sections, that each of these positions has a valid contribution to make to our understanding of the phenomenon of EBD. The central importance of "the concept of interpretation" (Furlong, 1985, p.103) to the interactionist approach to the study of society is the

cornerstone of the present study. It is argued throughout this study that the interpretive structures employed by pupils and their "significant others" give us unique insight into the causes and remedies of EBD. It is also argued, however, that these interpretive structures are subject to internal constraints in the sense of particular psychological needs for social approval, security and the esteem of others, as well as external institutional constraints. The latter, whilst having their origins in the interpretive structures of individuals, take the form of taken for granted "recipes" (Schutz, 1967), and thus have a determining effect on the individual's view of reality. It is argued, therefore, that the social environment of the individual helps to determine the individual's identity through the extent to which his fundamental psychological needs are met. On the other hand, the individual himself chooses from a range of possible modes of behaviour, and in turn influences the view of himself held by others. The choices the individual makes are based upon his perception of what best suits his particular needs. An individual whose self image is threatened by school failure or family discord, may turn to delinquency in order to fulfil his esteem needs owing to the availability of a delinquent peer group; alternatively he may simply withdraw from the school situation in order to avoid further failure. The choice between these two alternatives may be influenced by the meanings the individual attaches to them: the choice of the delinquent path may be made easier by the fact that such a path has been followed by a significant other on whom the individual might wish to model himself; the same path might be likewise rejected for the converse reason. Issues of cultural identity, relating to class, gender and race may also influence the choices made, by offering individuals fulfilment of their esteem needs through

identification with a social group which represents a set of values and norms which challenge those of the prevailing culture.

The study takes the following shape. Chapter 2 is an exploration of the available literature bearing reference to the effects of residential schooling on pupils with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties. The latter stages of this chapter deal with the recent studies of this topic (noting their scarcity) whilst the first part of the chapter is devoted to the "pioneer" workers in this field, who, it is suggested, whilst not providing very much research evidence for the success of their methods, present very interesting accounts of their methods and approaches which receive many echoes in more contemporary work in the field and incorporate important assumptions about the effects of such approaches. Chapter 3 deals with the theoretical approach to the present study, containing a justification of the interactionist approach to the present subject as well as a comparative element dealing with approaches made to similar studies. Chapters 4 and 5 present accounts of the two fieldwork studies, with detailed reference to the pupils' perceptions of their situations. Chapter 6 reports the findings of the questionnaires, and relates them to the interview studies. Chapter 7 provides a brief comparative analysis of the two institutions, focusing on the material and organizational features of the two schools. Chapter 8 involves an evaluation of the residential experience, by presenting a detailed theoretical analysis of the research findings, focusing on: the schools as "total institutions", the significance of "respite" in the outcomes of the residential experience, the quality of interpersonal relationships among the staff and pupils, the role of the school principal, and an analysis of the formal organization of

the schools. The term "re-signification" is also introduced in this chapter. Chapter 9 draws the study to a conclusion emphasising the importance of the effects of respite and the quality of interpersonal relationships on pupils and their "difficulties".

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW:

PIONEERS, EVANGELISTS AND OTHERS

In this chapter the writer will explore existing literature on the subject of the use of residential schooling in the treatment of EBD children and its effects. It should be made clear at the outset that, at the time of writing, no writer has presented a systematic study of this subject, of the type proposed here. However, there is a body of literature which deals with the nature and aims of a number of specific residential schools for EBD children. This body of literature provides a major source for our understanding of the *intended* effects of residential schooling of this type, and of the theoretical positions which underly the work of such schools. In addition to this there is a further more recent body of work which tends to deal with specific issues in the field of residential schooling and related provision. Finally, there are several studies of residential facilities, other than residential special schools, and their effects which illuminate some of the issues under consideration in this study.

There is, in fact, a dearth of published research concerned with residential special schools (EBD). Many of the more celebrated published works on the subject have exhibited a tendency to be anecdotal in quality and evangelical in tone. These apparent shortcomings can be attributed to

the fact that many of these inspiring texts were written by practitioners in the field, who were in the forefront of developments in residential work with EBD children and young people. These workers are rightly referred to as "pioneers" (Bridgeland, 1971), and as we shall see, they often occupied relatively isolated positions on the margins of the educational establishment. It is also a significant indicator of the practical nature of their work that their publications are more often than not directed at a wider audience than that of academics. These pioneers were unanimous in their condemnation of certain common child rearing practices, and many extended this condemnation to teaching methods common in mainstream schools (eg. Neill, 1916; Wills, 1960). Their aims, therefore, were not only to develop new strategies for undoing the damage done to many of their charges, but also to communicate their experiences to those most likely to benefit from them: notably parents, teachers and fellow residential workers. These writers were not so interested in communicating with those who wished to study "maladjusted" individuals, as those who interacted with such persons on a daily basis. This is not to say that research evidence based on the work of these pioneers does not exist, Burn (1956), Shaw (1965), Balbernie (1966), in Britain, and Bettelheim, (1955), in the USA, provide statistical data, with regard to varying degrees of academic rigour, indicating the degree to which such work could be considered to be "successful" or not. A second group of texts represents a range of relatively recent studies of the nature and outcomes of residential schools (EBD). Such texts are relatively rare, and tend to take the form of small scale studies reported in short journal articles. Other recent work in this area is to be found in larger texts concerned with EBD children in general. A third group of texts relevant to the present study

deal with the broader field of residential institutions for young persons, such as children's homes. The dangers of treating this last group of texts as being of automatic relevance to our understanding of residential special schools (EBD), has already been indicated (see introduction). However, a consideration of a selection of these texts is necessary, as will be shown in the present chapter.

The three categories of relevant literature, outlined above, will now be dealt with in greater detail.

I PIONEERS & EVANGELISTS

The period covered by the "pioneer" workers with maladjusted children of particular interest to the present writer, stretches from the mid 1930's to the late 1960's. The term "pioneers" was originated by Bridgeland (1971), and the dates mentioned are recognized by both Bridgeland and Laslett (1983) as spanning the period of greatest development in the field of residential schooling for "maladjusted" children. Bridgeland's study is concerned with a wide range of workers who made a specific and individual contribution to our understanding of "maladjusted" children. The present writer identifies W. D. Wills, O. Shaw, G. Lyward, R. Balbernie and A. S. Neill, from the group chosen by Bridgeland, because they were key innovators who became a reference point for many contemporaneous and later workers, and because the published material relating to their work concentrates specifically on the day to day experience of living and working with "maladjusted" children, which is of

course the central theme of the present study. For these reasons the work of Bettelheim is also considered.

The term "maladjustment" itself was first used to define a statutory category of handicap necessitating special educational provision in the 1945 Handicapped Pupils and School Health Service Regulations (HMSO, 1945) which elaborated on the terms of the 1944 Education Act (HMSO, 1944). The 37 year official "life" of this term, which ended in 1981 with the passing of the Education Act of that year (HMSO, 1981), was notable for the difficulties it created for those who attempted to define it. The 1945 regulations, the Underwood Report (HMSO, 1955), and the Pack Report (on truancy and indiscipline in Scottish schools, HMSO, 1977) each attempted definitions, and each accepted the unsatisfactory nature of their efforts. Galloway and Goodwin (1979), rightly, conclude that it is a "ragbag term" that was used with little precision, and was applied to children whose apparent failure to perform in accordance with certain expectations in the classroom could not be accounted for in terms of the other statutory categories of handicap. Rutter, et al. (1970) see the introduction of this unsatisfactory term more positively, as a chance to bring a hitherto ignored group of handicapped children under the umbrella of state funded special educational treatment. For pioneers, such as Wills and Lyward the implementation of the 1945 regulations marked the beginning of the period when they could begin to take on pupils regardless of the ability of their parents to pay. Others, however, (eg. Sharp and Green, 1975; Tomlinson, 1981, 1982, and Ford, et al., 1982) see the Act more as tool for marginalizing pupils who prove to be a hinderance to the smooth running of

mainstream schools, into either low status provision within or outwith the mainstream setting.

For the pioneers, maladjusted children were children in need of special treatment in order to repair the damage inflicted upon them often as a result of inadequate parenting and/or other unsatisfactory environmental features. In this sense the pioneers were not as far from the modern view of maladjustment as a socially constructed phenomenon as they might first appear. Whilst they had a tendency to view "maladjustment" as an illness (Laslett, 1983), the cause of that illness was "early deprivation or maltreatment" (Wills, 1960), or, as Burn (1956) points out, in his study of Lyward's work at Finchden Manor, the attempt by adults to make the child in their care "lead a life that was not his own". Wills, Lyward and Neill (1916, 1968) were also strong critics of the "life denying" (Neill, 1968) influence of mainstream schooling, and the potentially disastrous consequences this could have for the emotional development of pupils. The treatment offered by the pioneers involved the removal of the child from harmful influences, to an environment designed to offer the child experiences calculated to repair the damage done.

This view of maladjustment (and other forms of educational difficulty) as an illness of the individual child, has often been referred to, and condemned, as "the medical model" (eg. Ford, et al., 1982). It is argued that adherents to this model avoid tackling the social, causes of certain forms of socially deviant behaviour by focusing their attempts to remedy deviance on the individual rather than the environment in which the deviance occurs. Writers, such as Gillham (1981, 1984), and Sewell (1981)

explore this view at the micro level, whilst, others, such as Tomlinson (1982), Barton and Tomlinson (1984) and Ford et al. (1982) explore environmental influences at the macro level, describing the effects of political and economic factors, as well as those of certain status groups in society (eg. the medical profession, teachers and psychologists). It is importance, however, to consider the tradition, delineated by Bridgeland (1971), out of which the approach of the pioneers grew. One of the earliest "precursors" of the twentieth century pioneers, described by Bridgeland, was Mary Carpenter, who, in 1852, set up a reformatory as an alternative to the "essentially punitive" institutions which at that time existed for delinquent children. The important features of Carpenter's school were the absence of corporal punishment, and the emphasis on freedom for the boys, and the belief that "discipline" could be maintained "by the Master's own firmness, order and kindness". Bridgeland suggests that Carpenter anticipated the work of Bowlby and Winnicott by decades, in the belief that was enacted in her reform school (Red Lodge), that delinquent children are often victims of emotional deprivation in their early family lives, and that the remedy for this was to be found in providing them with the love and care of which they had been deprived. Thus whilst such a view might be seen as a side step of the root social and political causes of delinquency, it represented a radical shift away from the punitive and degrading provision which such children habitually faced at the hands of society, through their referral to workhouses and prisons in the nineteenth century.

This simple, and yet profound perception of Mary Carpenter's, that the deprived, delinquent and the disturbed were in need of care and

opportunities for personal development, through the provision of good quality interpersonal relationships rather than punishment and further deprivation, is a fundamental principle adhered to by all of the twentieth century pioneers. The particular manner in which they chose to enact this principle varies but the underlying message is always the same, and is perhaps best summarized by reference to the titles of two of David Wills's books on the subject of residential care for "maladjusted" and delinquent young people: *Throw Away Thy Rod* (1960) and *Spare The Child* (1971). Consideration will now be given to some of the writings of those pioneers who worked with "maladjusted" children in residential settings in the wake of the official recognition of "maladjustment" in the 1945 regulations.

Although it is possible to trace the origins of a therapeutic approach to the treatment of deprived, delinquent and disturbed children to the 19th century, it is made quite clear by many subsequent writers, both within and outwith the timespan of the present section, that authoritarian and punitive attitudes towards this group of children continued to exist in some residential institutions for many years (Bridgeland, 1971; Wills, 1941, 1971; Balbernie, 1966; Millham et al., 1975, 1978). It is a recognition of this fact which underlies much of what is written by the pioneers. In addition to this, all of the pioneer mentioned acknowledged a considerable debt to Freudian psychology. These two factors account for what Dawson (1981) describes as the four "tenets" which he believes characterize the work of all the pioneers. The tenets refer to the professed intentions of the pioneers in terms of their approach to their pupils. The tenets are:

1. the extension of "unconditional affection" to all pupils by staff
2. encouragement of "freedom of expression" in pupils
3. the enactment in the residential setting of the belief that self discipline develops through "self government" or "shared responsibility"
4. the psychoanalytical orientation of their work.

Each of the pioneers is so called because he made a particular contribution to the development of one or more of these areas, and/or because he directed this approach at a particular group of young persons.

To describe A.S. Neill, solely, as a pioneer worker with "difficult" school children, is to diminish the true stature of his contribution to education as a whole. Neill presented a critique of formal education and commonly held assumptions about child rearing which struck to the very heart of the culture. From 1916, when he published his first book, criticizing the destructive formality and joylessness of the national (Scottish) education system in which he worked, to the present day, the questions he posed and the answers he provided on the subject of the connections between authority in interpersonal relationships, personal development, education and learning, have continued to resound in families and educational institutions throughout this and many other lands. It is, however, as his biographer states, in the realm of his work "with problem children" that "Neill's most spectacular achievement" (p.392, Croall, 1983) is to be found. Neill's relevance to the present study is that his involvement with "difficult" children spans the entire period of time noted by Bridgeland (1971) as being occupied by the "pioneers" of his study.

Bridgeland describes Homer Lane as the "archetype" of the pioneers, and it is Lane who is identified by Neill as being the man with whom "child oriented education began" (Neill, 1972). It was Neill's personal dissatisfaction with the life-denying, spontaneity-stifling authoritarianism of state school education that led him to reject the state system, but it was, at his own admission (Neill, 1921), his witnessing at first hand the work of Lane at 'The Little Commonwealth', and the introduction Lane gave him to the works of Freud that provided the direction for his later work and ideas. Neill (1921) noted the presence of a number of elements in the ethos and organization of Lane's residential community for delinquent children (The Little Commonwealth) which were destined to become recurrent features in the schools of the pioneers. These elements were: the use of pupil self government, the emphasis on facilitating pupil self respect through increased rather than decreased pupil responsibility, and a belief in the essential goodness of man rather than in the doctrine of original sin. Lane also placed emphasis on the importance of manual work and the learning of manual skills. In Neill's subsequent work he developed Lane's prototype, particularly at his own school, Summerhill.

Central to Neill's approach was his sharing of the Freudian view that repression of the individual's expressions of emotional states and, particularly, sexuality, leads to the development of deep seated neuroses, which can impare the individual's social and emotional functioning. Neill (1916, 1921, 1968) focussed on the family and the school as major sources of repression, and in Summerhill created a school which stressed the freedom of pupils to live their lives as free of repression as was

practically, socially and legally possible. According to Neill, Summerhill differed from all other schools in that it was designed to meet the needs of pupils rather than having the expectation that pupils should change to meet its needs. Psychotherapy (referred to as "private lessons") was a common feature of the early years of Summerhill, but its importance as a formal feature of school life diminished with the passing years, in favour of Neill's increasing belief in the therapeutic power of an anti-authoritarian, child centred setting, which enabled children to be "free". (Neill, 1968, 1972; Croall, 1983). At Summerhill, Neill claims, school (ie. "lesson") attendance was never compulsory, by staff edict; the same applied to all other aspects of residential life. The school meeting, at which staff and pupils, it was claimed, had equal powers to table motions and to vote, was the legislature and court of the school, where pupils and staff shared in the organizational processes of the school, and, where necessary, were brought to book.

Neill is the first of the pioneers of interest to the present writer, because of the evangelical spirit with which he approached his work. Although he decried any kind of "indoctrination whether religious or moral or political" (Neill, 1968, p.9) for the children of Summerhill, and attacked as "useless" the teaching which went on in the "mass production factories" (his description of the state schools of his day), he was unashamedly didactic, dogmatic and authoritative in his writings on the subject of his work. In fact, one suspects, Neill's literary ambitions matched his educational ambitions in their intensity (see Croall, 1983). Neill's rebellious and revolutionary ideas made a major impact on many of his contemporaries, as well as ensuing generations of educators and some

parents. It is not surprizing, therefore, to find many similarities between the work of Neill and that of our second pioneer, George Lyward, who, like Neill, began his work with disturbed public school children in the inter-war years and became a spearhead figure in therapeutic movement.

Lyward, unlike Neill, was not a prodigious writer. The most thorough account of his work is, in fact, provided by an observer of his work at Finchden Manor (Burn, 1956). The perspective of an observer, however, is particularly interesting in this field of concern, simply because it is a rarity. As has already been noted, writings in this area have a tendency to be evangelical in tone; there is often little evidence of detachment (understandably) in the writings of the pioneers. Burn writes as a non-specialist, reporting what he sees as a journalist, rather than an educationist or psychologist.

A particularly interesting feature of Lyward's Finchden Manor was that whilst it began life in the 1930's as a public school, which like Summerhill took pupils from better-off families capable of paying public school fees, with the passing of the 1944 Education Act and the implementation of the 1945 regulations, boys of humbler backgrounds were brought to the school under LEA sponsorship. Thus for some (exact figures are not available) of Lyward's pupils Finchden Manor was truly an alternative to the state schools which Neill (and Lyward himself) found so unsatisfactory.

Bridgeland writes of Lyward's

belief in the unknowable and inexpressible, in the mysterious and poetic nature of life and the almost incidental existence of

organizational structures (Bridgeland, 1971, p.162).

This view is shared by Burn (1956), who goes to great pains to describe Lyward's disdain for all forms of "imprisoning formalism" (p.128), which, he believed, characterized traditional forms of schooling, constraining the development of positive relationships in the family. Lyward even rejected one of Dawson's (1981) four "tenets" as such: that of "self government". This rejection does not, however, unseat Dawson's argument; in the same way Bridgeland's remarks do not mean that Lyward's work is unintelligible to us. Burn shows us, in fact, that Finchden had a very particular "organizational structure", with its own formalities (of which "self-government", though not so called, was an integral part), on which the ethos of the school was founded.

Like Neill, Lyward's work was rooted in psychodynamic theory. Like Neill also, Lyward's use of formal psychoanalysis diminished with the passing of time, and "the deepened group life was allowed to loosen the bonds" (Bridgeland, 1971, p.146). This image of bondage is central to Lyward's vision, as recorded by Burn (1956). It was through the process of psychoanalytic "regression" that the pupils who came to Lyward were believed to escape the bondage of their repressed and "usurped" selves. Lyward's school provided a consciously designed setting in which pupils could pass from a state of "dependence" to one of "independence" (Burn, 1956, p.54). For Lyward, this meant giving pupils the opportunity to regress to a personal state that was prior to their earliest awareness of moral judgement. Lyward believed that many of the children he dealt with were victims of their parents, and other adults, who had "usurped" their lives by forcing them to live according to standards and aspirations that

were not their own. Lyward sought to provide a setting in which his pupils could be "weaned" toward "rebirth" as autonomous, independent persons (see Holly, 1973, and Barnes, 1976, for a more recent espousal of this doctrine with reference to the mainstream day school). Lyward was also (as a former school teacher) of the opinion that schools often played a major role in the "usurpation" process. Lyward abhorred the "imprisoning formalism" of school subjects, and rejected such traditional school formalities as timetables, rules and fixed term dates. In addition to this, Lyward claimed to exercise complete "suspension of moral judgements" (Burn, 1956, p.69), in dealings with his pupils.

At Finchden Manor Lyward attempted to create a community in which all its pupils could find absolute acceptance. The first step along this road was achieved by the recognition of the children's need for "respite" from those "imprisoning formalities" mentioned above. To this end there were no (overt) formal demands made upon pupils, in terms of dress, behaviour, school attendance or other activities. The aim of the community was to achieve a personal "rebirth" for its pupils from a state engendered by "a lifeless protocol of obligations" to "a spontaneity in human relations"; to a state of being which enables the child to say "I count" and "other people count" (p.237). Without naming it so, a central feature of the community life at Finchden was self-government. From their earliest days at Finchden children were forced, through the lack of formal rules, to take full responsibility for their own actions. It was through an informal system of personal obligations, among the boys, between staff and boys, and particularly between the boys and Lyward, that the children were guided toward a constructive and personally rewarding exercise of their

freedom. The children were believed to develop self respect through their involvement in the "co-operative group effort" (p.187); this was at the heart of the community's life. Pupils learned to value the contribution of others to the community effort and to recognize the importance and value of their own contribution.

In spite of his abhorance of "formality" and "organization", Lyward created a very specialized setting. The "organizational" aspects of the school centred on the type of people Lyward employed to work there. His criterion for staff selection rested solely on the personal qualities of candidates; he sought people who had already achieved the "rebirth" (or who had no need of it) that was his objective for his pupils. Such people had a profound respect for others and a confidence in themselves which would enable them to withstand rejection without the need to be defensive, whilst at the same time being prepared to offer themselves as fully as was necessary to the positive development of their pupils. These qualities, Burn indicates, were most fully personified by Lyward himself, and it is one of the major attributes of Burn's book (1956) that this is revealed. Lyward, like Neill, was perhaps the single most important feature of his community. It was through the personal warmth and tolerance he extended to all his pupils that he was able to gain their trust and confidence. He offered these children what he believed they had most notably lacked in their family lives: love. It was a love made up of trust, care and acceptance; which provided children with the vital, secure base from which they could embark on the sometimes hazardous path to independence.

Of all the pioneers David Wills stands out as the one whose experience is of particular interest to a modern reader concerned with EBD children in residential settings. Wills's writings differ from those of the other pioneers in that he is less concerned with psychological and spiritual theorizing (though his work is clearly founded in theory and belief), than with the day to day, practical and organizational matters. Like his fellow pioneers, Wills wished to sensitize his readers to the deficiencies which he observed in accepted child care practice (both institutional and familial), and to direct them to more positive and therapeutic approaches. Characteristically, Wills approaches his task in a practical manner, through the use of example. A second reason for singling out Wills lies in the fact that from his earliest work with delinquent juveniles (which started in 1936), through to the end of his career, as the warden of a probation hostel (in the early 1970's) Wills's work was state funded. This meant that the "clientele" he served tended to come from sections of society characterized by their low socio-economic status, and therefore, sharing much in common with children who today are statemented under the "non-normative" SEN categories (Squibb, 1981; Tomlinson, 1981). This is in contrast with many of his fellow pioneers who worked with fee paying pupils. It is probably because of this financial fact that Wills did not begin his work with "maladjusted" school children until after the passing of the 1945 regulations.

Unlike Neill and Lyward, Wills did not have a teaching background. Bridgeland (1971) informs us that Wills's early career was spent as a 'brother' in a farm training camp for delinquent youths. Here Wills, by his own admission, behaved in an authoritarian and bullying

manner toward the inmates, and it was his realization of the consequences of such behaviour, as both a mask and spur to delinquency, that formed the basis for much of his subsequent work; this is revealed repeatedly in his writings (see, Wills, 1941, 1960). In common with the other pioneers, Wills had a background in psychotherapy, and earlier than most, he recognized the therapeutic nature of a positive environment, and the lack of need, in this situation, for formal psychoanalysis (Wills, 1941). Another of Wills's major characteristics was his Christianity. Like Neill and Lyward, he saw his charges as being in need of love, and, more than either of these two men, Wills saw this in Christian terms. Thus, the term "evangelist" is particularly appropriate to Wills. This is not to say that any formal religious instruction took place in Wills's communities, and we have no evidence of Wills seeking to persuade his clients to become Christians - in fact, in his study of the Cotswold Community (Wills, 1971), he describes with approval the abolition of formal daily worship. Bridgeland, however, does suggest that Wills's central concern was with "moral re-education" (Bridgeland, 1971, p.30).

Wills, after 40 years of work with delinquent youths, "difficult" evacuee children, during World War Two, and "maladjusted" children, concluded that there is no fundamental difference between the delinquent child and the maladjusted child (Wills, 1960). The only means of distinguishing between the two groups was, he declared, in the fact that delinquents were so named as a result of their having been convicted in a courtroom, and, consequently, (at his time of writing) the two groups were subjected to different forms of treatment. Wills defined the "maladjusted" child as "one who has not learned how to make good affective relationships"

(1960, pp.16-17). This made the difference he perceived in the types of treatment prescribed for the two socially defined groups vital, since the one (approved schools) was characterized by a regime which was punitive, regimented and based on a formal pattern of imposed discipline, whilst the other (the residential school) was characterized by an intention to "cure", rather than punish, in a relaxed atmosphere which stressed informality between staff and pupils, and the development of self-discipline as opposed to imposed discipline. The residential school, clearly, was, in Wills's view, the setting most likely to help children to learn how to "make good affective relationships

Wills described Bodenham Manor as less of a school, and more of "a healing institution", and even more as "a substitute home" (1960, p.32). In order to provide a setting which gave pupils the sense of security, belonging and permanence, which he believed characterized a good home, Wills believed it was necessary to design a community which was to "revolve around the children" (p.34). Wills described four major ingredients which were necessary to achieve such a setting, these were: "loving and giving", "tolerance", "shared responsibility", and the ability of staff to deliver these necessities. Underlying each of these was the notion that adult child relationships in schools and families are often damaged by an "overrated" concept of "respect". This concept, which was often used as a tool for controlling children, tended to be based on fear and, consequently, impeded the development of healthy relationships which engendered opportunities for free and open communication. For this reason Wills constantly reiterates the need for "barriers" between staff and pupils to be broken down; staff must be "tolerant and permissive" and "want

to know children as they really are" (p.66). This meant that formal schooling could not be forced upon pupils. Pupils were only expected to attend lessons when they wished to, and when the time was ripe for schooling to contribute to the "healing process" (p.32). In his writings about Bodenham Manor (1960) Wills demonstrates, in a number of anecdotes, the way in which non authoritarian relationships between staff and pupils leads to the development of co-operation and mutual liking and respect. As Bridgeland (1971) points out, however, this does not mean that staff, and Wills in particular, were not often the subject of the Freudian phenomenon of "transference", wherein the therapist becomes the object of the subjects' unleashed feelings of love and hate that have been formerly repressed in their relationships. This was why the need for tolerance and unconditional love was so marked.

One of Wills's outstanding contributions to residential work is the development of the theory of "shared responsibility". This is a theory which Wills developed, refined and adapted over a 40 year period, on the basis of practical work (Wills, 1941, 1945, 1960, 1971). Wills chose the term "shared responsibility" with care. He recognized early in his career that "self-government" was not a realistic possibility in its fullest sense (1941). Wills, with characteristic honesty, realized that in a residential community for individuals who were considered too "difficult" there were many areas of their lives (chiefly of legal nature) which were, realistically, outside of their personal control. Wills noted this especially when he worked with school children at Bodenham Manor (Wills, 1960). Once the areas in which pupils could be permitted to exercise their own choice and control had been defined, however, Wills stressed the need

for the pupils' opportunities for the exercise of control to be maximized. Where possible pupils should have absolute control over their lives. They should have the opportunity to make decisions concerning their own lives and the life of the community in which they lived along with their fellow pupils and the staff. For Wills shared responsibility was "the natural vehicle for group therapy" (p.69). It provided a forum for dealing with personal/relationship difficulties, for sharing experiences, resolving conflicts, and, above all, learning to value others and be valued oneself for contributing to the co-operative venture which was the community. Characteristically, Wills devotes a good deal of space to defining the method by which such a system should be set up; he stresses, in particular the need for it to develop naturally from the children and for its outcomes to be respected by all, including staff.

Like Neill and Lyward, Wills saw the community as being a major therapeutic tool. All three of these men believed that the individual's ability to value himself derived directly from his recognition of the value of others, and that this recognition grows naturally out of the necessary sharing and co-operation that goes on in a community in which all members are expected to co-operate and where relationships are not authoritarian or coercive. Whilst Neill and Lyward, however, are often vague about the specific nature of the co-operation and the sharing, Wills is highly specific. It is a feature of each of the communities which Wills ran that inmates and staff shared in the practical day-to-day chores of maintaining the physical state of the community. At the Hawkspur Camp (Wills, 1941) this took its most extreme form in that the inmates (16-19 year old delinquent boys) and staff actually constructed the buildings which were to

house the community. In common with Homer Lane, Wills placed great stress on the dignity and personal satisfaction which was to be gained from manual labour and the mastery of physical skills. Given the social background from which most of his charges came, such experiences enhanced their employment prospects. Wills (1960) also makes the point that the pupils' concern with the practical day to day affairs of the community provided a necessary relief from the emotional intensity which could build up during group meetings when matters of a more personal nature were discussed.

In addition to reporting his own experiences as the founder and leader of various residential communities, another aspect of Wills's extensive contribution to our understanding of the therapeutic possibilities of residential treatment, is to be found in his study of Richard Balbernie's work at the Cotswold Community (Wills, 1971). This is a particularly interesting account since it is written, on the basis of direct observation, from the viewpoint of a man with a unique experience and knowledge of the field. In this book Wills describes Balbernie's endeavour to change a traditional approved school into a therapeutic community, along the lines of those created by Wills himself. Not only does this study reveal the importance of Balbernie as an innovator in the approved school system, but, in so doing, it also reveals a great deal about the effects of contrasting residential regimes, and the practical difficulties involved in facilitating the transition from one to another.

Wills describes the school prior to Balbernie's appointment as principal as being characterized by a hierarchical and autocratic structure which invested all authority in the office of the principal. This made the

exercise of individual authority by staff difficult and meant that pupils tended to hold junior staff in contempt. The mechanisms which underpinned this regime were: regimentation, the shouting of orders, enforcement of authority by punishment or threat of punishment, and particularly corporal punishment, and the dominance of a competitive privilege system. As a direct consequence of this authoritarian and coercive regime the informal "underlife" of the institution (cf. Goffmann, 1960) was a caricature of the formal system, and it too was based on tyranny, bullying, and other forms of human debasement, such as extortion and prostitution. The staff saw themselves as a "separate and privileged caste" (p.28), and this was aped by the more dominant boys. A setting more diametrically opposed to the therapeutic ideal would be difficult to imagine, and yet Wills and others (eg. Millham et al., 1975) suggests that such was a common pattern in English approved schools. In an attempt to re-route the direction of the community to one based on sharing and co-operation, Balbernie is reported to have devised a 12 point plan which delineates both the particular needs of the individuals in his community and the fundamental principles of the therapeutic approach with regard to interpersonal relations. The 12 points are:

1. never lose sight of the potentialities of any man;
2. respect him for his potentialities;
3. do not despise anyone for not living up to his potentialities;
4. don't be contemptuous of younger, smaller, stupider, weaker people just for those things;
5. staff must listen to pupils;
6. pupils should be encouraged to speak freely;
7. staff must accept what pupils have to say;
8. matters must be discussed by all community members on frank and equal terms;
9. action should be taken, where necessary, on the basis of such discussions;
10. respect for individuals is vital;

11. the essential worth of the human personality must be recognized by all;
12. the rights of man are always paramount.

In order to establish these points it was necessary to dismantle the old authority/privilege system. Balbernie attempted to do this over a 9 week period in a series of group meetings. The meetings were "negative and destructive" (p.43), with much personal animosity toward Balbernie from both staff and pupils alike. For what Balbernie was in fact doing, in dismantling the old system, was removing what had become the basis for their sense of security, no matter how precarious and anxiety laden this had been. He was attacking what had come to be seen as the desirable model of "masculinity", among staff and pupils alike, which was based upon domination through the exertion of power. Furthermore, by stressing the equal worth of all community members and casting off his divine right to rule Balbernie created a sense of loss and leaderlessness within the community, at a time when it was felt to be most needed.

Wills himself marvels at Balbernie's sticking power throughout the period of turmoil and intense personal animosity which the changes he introduced unleashed. However, he describes the way in which, after many staff resignations and new appointments, and the reorganization of the school into small "cottage" units, that a greater sense of harmony began to descend upon the community. Wills does not conclude the book with an attempt to convince readers that any magical transformation had taken place at the school. He does, however, demonstrate through reference to particular incidents, the way in which the character of the community had shifted from one concerned with control and coercion to one where "love and

concern" (p.152) were more prominent among the interpersonal relationships within the community.

Wills's literary contribution to this sphere is perhaps best summed up in terms of the way in which he provides us with a uniquely profound understanding of the practicalities involved in the enactment of the "freedom" and "love" which form the very core of the therapeutic approach. His is a truly muscular evangelism (in the particular figurative sense of the word in use by the present writer and in the more conventional religious sense), which confronts the pitfalls and setbacks head on, and which tends to avoid claims of the miraculous.

The last of the pioneers of particular interest to the present writer, and identified by Bridgeland is Otto Shaw. Shaw is of interest because, like Neill, Lyward and Wills, he created a therapeutic community with a unique and innovative character and organization, and propounded certain highly distinctive ideas on the subject (Shaw, 1965, 1969). It is claimed that Shaw became interested in education as a result of having read some of Neill's writings (Bridgeland, 1971). Shaw's school, Red Hill, shared many characteristics with other pioneer schools already mentioned. Like Summerhill and Bodenham Manor, Red Hill was, initially a coeducational school, though during the 1940's it became a school for boys only. Like Lyward, Shaw selected children for the school on the basis of above average scholastic ability. Like Neill and Wills, he employed a formal system of "self government". In common with Bodenham Manor, the pupils of Red Hill were funded by LEA's. Like all of the pioneers, Shaw ran the

school along psychotherapeutic lines. Of all of the pioneers Shaw is the one who appears, in his writings, to be most deeply committed to the use of formal analysis throughout the recorded history of his work. He also presents his work in the form of an academic clinical psychologist, drawing extensively on case study material to illustrate particular forms of psychological disturbance and their remedies.

Shaw sought through psychoanalysis to lead his pupils toward greater self knowledge, so that they could form better interpersonal relationships, and so be more contented human beings. This contentment, Shaw argued, facilitates the necessary emotional stability which allows for the unimpeded exercise of intellectual ability (Shaw, 1969). It is in this last matter that Shaw's approach is unique. More than any other of the pioneers Shaw's aim was to provide his pupils with a distinctly academic education. Although Shaw emphasised that the resolution of psychological difficulties must precede formal education, where such a resolution is completed he makes it very clear that formal education in a classroom is an important next step, and, therefore, lessons at Red Hill were compulsory, with teachers exercising a high degree of authority over pupils in a manner reminiscent of a state day school (Shaw, 1965), and, one suspects, quite at odds with the requirements of Neill, Wills or Lyward. In this sense Shaw's approach is far less radical than that of Lyward or Neill, and reveals a philosophy which is less critical of certain, often unquestioned, authority relationships which exist in society.

Although a self confessed admirer of A.S. Neill, more than any of his fellow pioneers, Shaw saw his pupils' difficulties in terms of an

illness of the individual; he finds less fault with the broader social climate. This is reflected, in part, in the formalism of Red Hill, where there was less emphasis on personal freedom than is suggested by the other pioneers, and a greater stress on the constraints on behaviour imposed by Shaw's particularly involved system of self government. This system is composed of a large number of committees which, in addition to having very clear spheres of responsibility (eg. the library; food and hygiene; hobbies etc.) and being of precise and selective composition, have clearly defined powers in respect of the control they exert over members of the school and, where appropriate, punishments they may inflict. Corporal punishment is, of course, proscribed by Shaw. All this is indicative of Shaw's view of the curative function of the school and the belief that, once "cured", pupils can be returned to their families and communities where they will be expected to function "normally". This view is certainly at odds with that propounded by Neill, who sees Summerhill "graduates" as, in many ways, "free" and, therefore, less easily influenced by an oppressive and manipulative world which drives people to strive and compete because they lack the self-confidence (of Summerhill graduates) to be free. There is a similar, though perhaps less pronounced, anti-worldliness in the essentially spiritual messages of Lyward and Wills, both of whom, in their work, challenge certain predominant social values. Lennhoff (1966) might be cited as providing a community (Shotton Hall) closer to Shaw's model, in that he too, whilst advocating a strongly therapeutic approach, provided a more restrictive and formally organized environment for his pupils. Lennhoff, however, stresses the need for flexibility in relation to formal education to a greater extent than does Shaw.

One of the most outstanding aspects of Shaw's work is the fact that he attempts to present some indication as to the outcomes of the therapeutic regime at Red Hill. This takes the form of follow-up studies of his former pupils. Shaw presents data drawn from annual reports, based on feedback from caring and judicial agencies, as well as former pupils and their families. The most recent published account of these reports refers to the year 1968 (Bridgeland, 1971) and accounts for all of the pupils who passed through the school between 1934 and that date. Of the total number of pupils 61% (N=396) were declared to be "cured", 7% "cured or improved", and 11% "improved". 18% were considered to have "failed" (including 7% who were withdrawn from the school prematurely), and 2% of the pupils had died. As with all such studies (as will become increasingly apparent) there are difficulties with Shaw's criteria for judgement, a point noted by critics (eg. Topping, 1983, and Galloway and Goodwin, 1987). The term "cured" is defined as "a radical resolution of the child's maladjustment" and the "after history shows the boy to be balanced happy and contented" (Bridgeland, 1971, p.169). The "improved" category refers to pupils who since leaving Red Hill have earned a "useful" living, have not been in trouble with the law, but the "resolution" of whose "conflicts" remains "incomplete". Details of how happiness and contentment are measured are not forthcoming and measures of recidivism are not necessarily related to the inclination to or practice of delinquency. Similarly, "the resolution of the child's maladjustment" is a bold claim which can rarely be made with certainty. Shaw himself, in fact, suggests that one of the most telling indicators of such "resolution" would be a detailed examination of the consequences of the former pupil's child rearing practices (Shaw, 1965). However, whilst these criticisms should never be ignored, it must be stated

that such findings are indicative of positive changes which have taken place in former pupils' lives, since, if nothing else, many of these pupils came to Shaw as a result of being of particular concern to those agencies (families, judiciary etc.) which provided data for the follow-up studies, the fact that such concern appears to have diminished is a positive sign (this is not to say that it provides conclusive proof of the efficacy of Shaw's methods).

Richard Balbernie has already been mentioned in this chapter in relation to his work at the Cotswold Community (Wills, 1971). He is counted here among the "pioneers and evangelists" not so much for his achievements as an innovator in this field than as a rare example of a practitioner who attempted a detailed and critical analysis of the outcomes of his own work with disturbed and delinquent children (Balbernie, 1966). Balbernie is in fact a "second generation" pioneer, in that much of his practice is derived from a study of the pioneers already mentioned. His contribution is, however, unique in its attempt to explore rather than evangelize; this allows him to be counted as a pioneer.

Balbernie (1966) studied 32 leavers from a residential community for "maladjusted and delinquent boys" (p.1). This is far more than a simple follow-up study. Balbernie is the first British worker in this field to subject his own work to detached academic scrutiny. He describes the experience of mounting such a residential enterprise as "bewildering" and admits to feelings of "helplessness and perplexity" (p.1) in facing the task. Balbernie's study, therefore, attempts to tackle these difficulties by, firstly, determining the most desirable organizational shape and ethos

of a residential therapeutic community, on the basis of a study of available research data. He then goes on to relate the findings of detailed follow-up studies of 32 leavers to their residential school experience.

Balbernie is the first of the (British) pioneers to introduce an academic sociological perspective into the study of residential institutions of the type under consideration. He draws on the work of Bettelheim (1948, 1955) and Jones (1960), as well as the less sociologically informed work of the pioneers already mentioned in the present chapter, to determine the following principles which should underly the residential community:

1. the regime should be democratic and non-punitive; adult roles should be active, participant and responsive;
2. the community should reflect the qualities of a "really good family and home"; it should also offer additional relationship security, unconditional acceptance, and specific remedial treatment;
3. central to this work is the endeavour to develop caring and constructive relationships with the children, and to take a leadership role that is normally the province of the effective father;
4. the residential setting should be child-centred and personalized, so as to meet the unique complexity of each pupil's difficulties; to this end the community should, where necessary, be made up of a combination of interdependent small units;
5. families should be involved in therapy (though Balbernie feels unable to define the nature of the involvement) and fragmentation of the child's life (ie. loss of family contact) should be avoided; the difficulties involved in achieving these two ends means that it is very important for the residential community to provide intimate and positive primary reference groups which are essential for social maturation and intense family casework;

6. emphasis should be placed on providing continuity of strong, meaningful relationships with one or two adults, as an aid to moral and character development; these relationships should be underpinned by a genuine concern and respect for the individuality of others;
7. the environment must always be "ego-supportive", providing special opportunity to discover both specific strengths and accept specific weaknesses.

Balbernie's study of 32 leavers found that 26 cases presented clear evidence of improvement during their period of residential treatment (in terms of the presence of presenting symptoms), whilst only 11 cases showed clear evidence of a "stable work record" in the 2 years immediately subsequent to leaving the school. On the other hand in 27 cases there was a marked deterioration or no change in "already markedly adverse family circumstances", and 28 cases in which there was evidence of a pattern of "seriously disturbed family relationships" over the 5 year period after leaving the school. Twenty-one cases exhibited evidence of a disturbed work record in the first 2 years after treatment. A total of 12 cases showed evidence of "a critical, demanding and carefully planned relationship with a "special member of staff during treatment and which was sustained and clarified" after leaving the community. Balbernie stresses, as key findings, the almost universal lack of stable and supportive family backgrounds for the subjects of his study. For these children the school provided an alternative form of family life, and those few children who made a satisfactory adjustment to life after school (ie. who maintained a successful work record and and were not convicted of criminal offences) were those who had developed close relationships with staff members which continued after leaving school. Balbernie claims that only 41% of the leavers surveyed had sustained the improvements gained during their stay at

the school over the 5 years subsequent to their discharge. This Balbernie admits is a disappointing result, and he concludes that this points to the lack of precision in placing the children in accordance with their particular needs. As a result of this finding Balbernie identifies as "crucial" the need to "determine what is going to be the position at the end of treatment and to plan accordingly" (P.132). He also demonstrates the need for the school's involvement with its pupils to continue after they officially cease to be pupils at the school.

A precursor of Balbernie, in seeing the environment as the central component of therapy is Bruno Bettelheim. Much of what comprises Bettelheim's "milieu therapy" (Bettelheim and Sylvester, 1948) bears a strong resemblance to the therapeutic communities devised by the British pioneers so far mentioned. Whilst, for the British pioneers the character and nature of the community is described by them as emerging from the treatment process, for Bettelheim, who combines a background in Freudian psychology with an understanding of the sociology of institutions, the "milieu" is the starting point, designed as a form of treatment: "a particular social organization, which would be the matrix within which the children might begin to develop a new life" (Bettelheim, 1955, p.2). Bettelheim stresses the need for tolerance of anti-social behaviour and even its short-term encouragement in certain cases. Therapy takes precedence over academic study. Emotional needs take precedence over orderliness, cleanliness and property in terms of importance. The staff of the school are bound by the standards and rules of the community as much as the pupils, and are required to live by a "much more exacting and honest morality than is required by society" (Bettelheim, 1955, p.3). From the

start Bettelheim stressed the therapeutic value of the community as opposed to individual psychotherapy, arguing that "only measures arising from benign interpersonal relationships among adults and children" can combat the emotional disturbance which, Bettelheim suggests, derive most often from the "absence of meaningful continuous interpersonal relationships" (Bettelheim and Sylvester, 1948, p.191). For him "the continuously maintained one-to-one relationship within the therapeutic milieu" (p.206) is the vital component of therapy. This demands respect and care of the pupil and his needs and wishes, and a recognition of the child's needs for personal space, privacy and some degree of control over his environment. Like Wills (1960), Bettelheim limits the sphere of the pupil's control. Bettelheim does not advocate any formal system of self-government, but a degree of shared responsibility is implied. All in all Bettelheim's community adheres more closely to traditional hierarchic child-adult relations, with a great deal of stress being placed on the personal qualities of adults, who are relied upon to foster "benign", non authoritarian interpersonal relationships with children.

Bettelheim also sees the physical environment itself as a major therapeutic tool, along with the routines and organizational patterns imposed by the adults on the community (Bettelheim, 1950). Bettelheim argues that pupils needs for love and security are not only met through the presence of sympathetic and caring adults, but through a carefully planned environment, each facet of which is made to offer optimum reinforcement to the pupils' belief that they are cared for, valued and respected. Thus, each stage of the pupil's career at the school is carefully managed, from

his/her first encounter with the school and its staff to the point where the child's treatment can be said to be complete. Children are not forced into close relationships with staff at the outset, but are merely supplied with their needs and made aware of the availability of staff, in the early stages. Matters, such as the quality of decor and furnishings, and other physical provision, such as bathrooms and dining utensils, are considered to be of considerable significance in providing pupils with effective "ego strengthening" experiences. Similarly, staff behaviour in waking pupils, and otherwise directing and supervising them has to be of a supportive and non-threatening nature, allowing pupils, where necessary, to "act out" their behaviour difficulties. Classroom work, as for many of the other pioneers, is only one facet of the total therapeutic environment; there is no compulsion to study though Bettelheim sees classroom success and enjoyment of the classroom experience as a vital outcome of successful treatment (Bettelheim, 1950, p.169). Similarly, the pupils' ability to engage in and find rewarding everyday social events, such as mealtimes, periods of play and rest (both supervised and unsupervised), and contacts with "the outside world", are vital to Bettelheim's measure of successful treatment.

Of particular interest are the results which Bettelheim claims to have achieved with these methods. Bettelheim's results are not presented with anything approaching the thoroughness of Balbernie, and Bettelheim admits to their fundamentally "subjective" nature, they are, however, particularly striking. Between 1948 (when the Orthogenic School, Chicago opened) and 1953, Bettelheim claims that 93% (N=31) of his pupils derived positive improvements from their treatment at the school. This includes 15

pupils claimed to be "rehabilitated", 11 "much improved" and 3 "somewhat improved", whilst only 2 pupils were observed to have achieved "no lasting improvement" (Bettelheim, 1955, p.14). These figures are supported by no detailed analysis, though Bettelheim does produce very detailed case studies (Bettelheim and Sylvester, 1948; Bettelheim, 1955) indicative of various levels and stages of "improvement", judged in psychoanalytic terms.

Each of the pioneers discussed share in common the fact that they practised a form of "planned environmental therapy", a term attributed to Dr. Marjorie Franklin and David Wills (Righton, 1975), and defined as:

a deliberate use of everyday living experiences, shared by a team of professional workers and one of a variety of client groups, in order to achieve a complete or partial solution of the problems confronted by the members of the client group.

Righton, 1975, p.3)

As we have seen the emergence of the environment as a major therapeutic tool occurred at different stages in the careers of the pioneers. The nature of the emergent environments, however, share a great deal of common ground, often because of direct influence, which in most cases is traceable to A.S. Neill, and through shared sources, notably the psychoanalytical theories of Freud. What is of special interest to the modern reader of these works, particularly one with an "educational" perspective, is the stress which each writer places on the need for non-authoritarian child-adult relationships, the recognition of the child's fundamental need for warm, caring and supportive relationships in a stable and predictable environment, and the recognition of children's rights to have and explore their own aims and purposes within such an environment. For many of these

pioneers the problems of their clients often stemmed from the failure of their home environments to provide these needs, and these problems were often exacerbated by the authoritarian and impersonal nature of conventional state (and private/public) day and boarding schools.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the work of these pioneers, and others, such as Aichorn, Lennhoff, Anna Freud and Docker-Drysdale, who also contributed to the development and dissemination of therapeutic work with disturbed children, is the resonance of their ideas which is felt as strongly today in educational circles as it has ever been. Recent literature dealing with the institutional and interpersonal climates in our mainstream schools contain many echoes of (though few direct references to) the writings of the pioneers. There is a growing number of powerful texts which focus attention on the way in which the poor quality of interpersonal relationships between staff and pupils can influence, in a negative way, the development of pupils' identities, and thus affect social and educational outcomes for pupils (Sharp and Green, 1975; Hargreaves, et al., 1975; Reid, 1985; Cronk, 1987). Other studies have detected in mainstream schools repressive tendencies which militate against individualism and creativity in pupils and which manifest themselves in both the social organization and interpersonal relationships which exist in some modern mainstream schools (Silberman, 1970; Illich, 1973; Schostak, 1982, 1983; Denscombe, 1985). Some writers, locate the source of these problems in the value systems of the society in which the schools exist, and see the role of the school to socialize pupils to accept the inequalities and other difficulties which stem from this repressive ideology (Holly, 1973; Sharp and Green 1975; Harris, 1979; Apple, 1980).

Other writers present a less pessimistic view by observing in mainstream schools an association with certain institutional forms and particular educational and social outcomes for pupils, both positive and negative (Rutter et al. 1979; Reynolds, 1976, 1979, 1984; Tattum, 1982; Gillham, 1984). These studies can also be related to modern views as to the need for pupils to play an active role in the creation and manipulation of knowledge as a means toward more effective learning, with the concomitant requirement for non-authoritarian, pupil centred teacher approaches which stress the importance of the pupil's intentions and perceptions in the learning process (Barnes, 1976; Rogers, 1978).

Whilst these writers approach their subject from a wide range of perspectives and embody a diversity of ideologies, they each share with the "pioneers" the conviction that the way in which teachers and pupils relate to one another can have a profound effect on the social, emotional and educational development of pupils, and that the manner in which these two groups relate is influenced, to a large extent, by the values and assumptions which are embodied in the organizational design of the school. This shows the relevance of the writings of the "pioneers" to the modern education world. This relevance is further underlined by several modern mainstream pioneers who have attempted to create state day schools which express an appreciation of these values (MacKenzie, 1970; Berg, 1968; Duane, 1972; Head, 1974; Fletcher, et al. 1985). We find that many of these modern "progressives" attempted (and continue the attempt in some cases) to employ strategies that were first introduced in the pioneer residential schools. Self-government in the form of school councils which include a heavy pupil representation are common in these progressive

schools, as are relaxed, informal, non-authoritarian staff-pupil relationships.

It becomes possible, after a consideration of much such mainstream innovations, to see the pioneer residential schools as the often unacknowledged seed-bed of many progressive methods and modes of organization. This realization also leads us to consider the extent to which modern residential schools (EBD) continue to be such a "seed-bed", and to ask what, if anything can the mainstream learn from these institutions. These questions will be addressed in the present study. Partial answers to these questions can, however, be gained from a consideration of a wider range of literature dealing with this subject than that written by the pioneers.

II OTHER WRITINGS CONCERNED WITH RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS (EBD) AND EBD CHILDREN

Outside the realm of the pioneers we find a range of literature which is marked by a diversity of views of residential schooling, and which, when taken as a whole, presents a more critical and far less certain faith in this form of provision for EBD pupils than is evident in the writings of the pioneers. This "loss of faith" can be attributed largely to changes in the theories of the nature and cause of maladjustment. The 1970's saw a move away from psychodynamic theories towards a "behavioural model" (Laslett, 1983). The behavioural model sees "maladaptive" behaviour

as learned behaviour which is best corrected through the manipulation of the stimuli in the environment which influenced the development of the undesired behaviour. This view tends to cast doubt on the efficacy of residential methods. This body of literature, which mostly spans the past 10 years, can be divided into three main types of work: those concerned with modern practice and philosophy; those reporting studies of various aspects of residential schooling (EBD), and those dealing with the subject in the context of a broader appraisal of EBD pupils.

Recent texts dealing with the philosophy and practice of the range of residential schools (EBD) are fairly thin on the ground. In fact in the last 10 years only one book devoted entirely to this subject has been published. Cole (1986) provides a useful, if somewhat sketchy, overview of residential special schools in the context of national educational and social policies. The apologist tone of Cole's book is symptomatic of the current policy climate he describes, which is characterized by the preference for intervention strategies in pupils' homes and schools, and for fostering when family breakdown occurs. Cole makes a case for residential schools as a last resort facility, when other preferred options fail, and as a pragmatic solution to the ineffectiveness of some community initiatives, caused by failings in the organization and funding of these projects. He does, however, air the view, which is increasingly heard in social work circles (Davis, 1981; Potter, 1986; Jervis, 1988, Wagner, 1988), that short term residential placements may be preferable to fostering, not least because residential care provides a supplement to family care which may be seen as less of a threat to family

unity than a fostering placement, which may be seen as a replacement family and therefore a rejection of the natural family.

Cole also describes the range of EBD residential schools which now exist. He describes five types of school orientation: psychoanalytic, therapeutic community, behaviour modification, family group and federal approaches, and what he calls "the orthodox approach". In common with Laslett (1981) and Dawson (1981), Cole notes the decline in the popularity of the psychoanalytical approach, but indicates the similarities it shares, in institutional make-up, with the therapeutic communities (see also Begg, 1982). The stress on the "milieu" as a treatment medium is also the basis of the family group and federal approaches. Like the therapeutic community, these institutions stress the therapeutic value of shared responsibility in the daily life experiences of the small living unit, as the importance of caring and supportive interpersonal relationships between all community members. The schools employing behaviour modification utilize techniques such as contracting, token economies and intensive pupil observation strategies as means of defining and reinforcing desired behaviour patterns. The "orthodox approach", which Cole describes as the most widespread approach, tends to be found in LEA schools (Wilson and Evans, 1980). Such schools place considerable emphasis on schoolwork and traditional values. They tend to be more hierarchical in structure than the other types of school. Each of these settings, however, share a common view as to the vital importance of caring, supportive and non-threatening adult/pupil relationships. They share this in common with the pioneer schools. Cole's view of "orthodox schools", their character and their tendency to stress good staff-pupil relationships, is supported by Wilson

and Evans's (1980) study of "good practice" among LEA provision for disturbed pupils. This observation also underlines one of Cole's major contentions: that through the experiences of personal and social success, which pupils gain in the well run residential school, their self-images and levels of self-esteem improve, and the attractions of anti-social behaviour diminish. The importance of self-esteem in relation to school disaffection has been noted elsewhere (Hargreaves, 1981; Bond, 1987; Lund, 1987) as needing to be a major focus of attention for educationalists; this makes Cole's observations (supported by small scale unpublished research, see Cole, 1981) all the more significant.

Cole's work suggests that many of the values expressed by the pioneers are still adhered to in residential schools. Dawson (1980, 1981) and Wilson and Evans (1980) provide large scale research evidence to support this claim. Rose (1978), in describing his work and that of his staff at the Peper Harrow school for severely disturbed boys, whilst espousing a psychotherapeutic approach to treatment, stresses the vital importance of the individual's total environment as an influence on behaviour. Rose echoes Bettelheim (1950) when he refers to the importance of a "good atmosphere" in the school, which serves to "defuse", though not destroy or "emasculate", pupils' aggressive tendencies. This helps to create a "sense of security" which is the basis for the pupils' sense of well being. Because this sense of security is so highly prized, all members of the community work to sustain it through their daily interactions, and so "they [the pupils] find themselves able to become the good person they had always secretly wished themselves to be" (p.5). The basis for the creation of this "atmosphere" is to be found in the overall

design of the community which stresses the equal participation of staff and pupils in the organization and running of the school, and in the way in which the physical environment is designed to provide for the pupils' needs for good quality "primary experiences".

Whilst the internal institutional framework of many of these schools appears to be similar to the pioneer schools - in terms of the stress on interpersonal relationships, avoidance of authoritarian approaches to child care and emphasis on allowing pupils freedom of expression (Dawson, 1981) - the theoretical and policy models which underpin these practices have undergone changes. The ascendancy of behaviourist explanations of and remedies for emotional and behavioural difficulties (Laslett, 1983) has led to a welcome denial of individual pathology models of EBD. Dennis Jones (1979) advocates an "interactionist approach" to therapeutic intervention in both day and residential schools for EBD children. Central to this approach is the view that the individual's behaviour is a function of the interaction between the "Person" and his "Situation".

This is not to say, as some less sophisticated behaviourists might claim, that residential schools are, therefore, redundant: the "dinosaurs of the education system" (Cole, 1986). On the contrary the residential setting can be seen as occupying a place in the continuum of care and education envisaged by Warnock (1978). Where the individual's home or community environment is providing him/her with experiences which serve only to reinforce negative patterns of behaviour and where these influences are not amenable to corrective treatment it may be in the

individual's interests to be placed in a residential setting which is designed to reinforce positive behaviour patterns. This will in turn assist in the development of a positive self image which may enable the individual to be more self critical and less vulnerable to negative influences in the home setting (Righton, 1975; Rose, 1978). This view is also shared by the Wagner committee (Wagner, 1988), who, taking a social work perspective, see the range of residential facilities, including those small scale schools of the type under consideration, as providing an important service within the context of a continuum of care which includes these alongside community based provision. Both Wagner and Warnock are at pains to recognize the valuable contribution to be made by residential services, and to encourage flexibility in their use and their integration with "community" and "mainstream" services, both recognizing that it is the failure of referring agencies to use residential provision in this integrated way that has led to many of the shortcomings perceived to be attached to this form of provision.

An acceptance of this continuum model, whilst stressing the importance of a therapeutic school environment, demands a further stress on family and community involvement in the individual's treatment programme. This point is noted by Powell (1977) who advocates (in anticipation of the Warnock Report, 1978) the use of residential schools as "treatment" and "assessment" centres. Following Balbernie (1966), Powell recognises the mismatch which sometimes exists between the pupils and the residential setting in which they are placed. This mismatch, he suggests, is often due to inadequate assessment procedures which take insufficient account of the individual's particular needs and whether or not they are best met in the

home environment. Righton (1975) in his reappraisal of approaches to Planned Environmental Therapy suggests that many of ^{the} benefits of residential treatment can be often undermined by the stigmatized public image residential institutions often have and by the isolation of the inmate from "significant others" and society in general, which can accompany such placements. Righton argues that such stigma and isolation are unnecessary and can be combatted by policy shifts which make residential treatment available to a wider range of people for shorter terms, and integrate its provision with community and family care. The same view is echoed 13 years later in the Wagner Report (1988), which envisages the full range of child care services, including residential provision, operating in an integrated and flexible way in order to meet the long and short term needs of children and their families.

Millham (1987) describes one of the major challenges facing residential schools (EBD), in the late 1980's and beyond, as lying in the area of the "management of children's separations implicit in a residential placement" (p.9). Drawing on recent research into the parallel field of children in local authority care who are separated from their families (Millham et al., 1986), Millham suggests that children in special residential schools are more likely to experience difficulty in maintaining necessary positive contact with their families than children separated by virtue of hospital treatment or private boarding education. This is due to the fragile and often fragmented state of the EBD child's family. Millham, therefore, perceives the need for residential schools (EBD) and placement agencies to take increased account of pupils' home circumstances before, during and after residential placement; to minimize disruption to the

child's family network throughout treatment and to make increased efforts to improve and encourage opportunities for parents and their children in care to gain access to one another (where this is not formally assessed to be detrimental to either party).

Reports of research carried out in residential schools (EBD) is very thin on the ground (Millham, 1987). The recent research which does exist tends to be small scale and to reflect the concerns outlined above. The influence of behaviourist psychology is reflected in studies of the efficacy of behaviour modification techniques, and the stress on pupils' home community is reflected in follow-up studies studies, an interest in "reintegration" and family involvement in therapy. There is also a growing interest in the perceptions held by the pupils of their residential experience.

The use of behavioural theory as a means of correcting maladaptive behaviour has been described with reference to case study material from residential schools (EBD) by a number of writers. These studies describe the successful use of a token economy (Burland, 1978; 1979), behavioural contracts (Gobell, 1984), the combination of time out, role play, positive reinforcement and behavioural contracts (Brown and Green, 1986). The use of behavioural contracts in the home environment is also described by B. Brown (1985). Brown (1985) stresses the "pragmatic", "self-critical" and "tangible" nature of behavioural intervention strategies. It is the tangible and pragmatic nature of the behaviour rating scale which seems to be its most attractive feature, in that such a scale claims to quantify observed behaviour and, therefore, record the

effects of intervention in real-life situations. The self critical aspect of behavioural theory lies in its avoidance of causation explanations and its concomitant reliance on correlation and falsifiable hypotheses.

Studies which have attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of residential schooling (EBD), as has already been pointed out, are rare. Those which have been undertaken have tended to be of the "follow-up" variety. One of the earliest of such studies, but still much referred to, is that conducted by Shields (1962). In a study of 216 boys who left a residential school over an 11 year period, Shields claimed that 84% had made a "reasonable adjustment to life and work", whilst 14% had been admitted to approved schools and Borstals. Shields's heavy reliance upon recidivism rates and the somewhat subjective nature of the assessment of "adjustment" make the high measure of success somewhat suspect. Laslett (1985) contacted 38 leavers who had left residential schools between 4 and 6½ years prior to the study. On the basis of interviews with them, he concluded that 26, at the time of interview, were experiencing a satisfactory level of social adjustment, 9 exhibited "cause for concern" and 3 were experiencing an unsatisfactory level of adjustment. The majority of respondents expressed positive attitudes to their former schools. Once again measures of adjustment are, Laslett admits, highly subjective. It is interesting to note, however, that a higher proportion of the "cause for concern" and unsatisfactory adjustment groups expressed dissatisfaction with their school experience than the "satisfactory" group.

Perhaps the most interesting of the recent follow-up studies is that carried out by Lampen and Neill (1985). This study of 60 leavers from

Shotton Hall School, like Laslett's study, explores these individuals' current situation as well as their retrospective views of their school experience. Unlike Laslett, Lampen and Neill offer a relatively detailed analysis of the link between the school's professed aims, the former pupils' views and their current degree of adjustment. Measures of adjustment are also clearly stated in terms of observed/recorded personality disorder, difficulties in sex/love relationships and criminality measures. The professed aims of the school, as initiated by its first and most illustrious principal Fred Lennhoff (Lennhoff, 1966), bears many similarities with the schools of the pioneers (with whom Lennhoff is often numbered, Bridgeland, 1971; Laslett, 1977). The approach to treatment at the school was based on a psychotherapeutic approach which stressed the importance of individual relationships between pupils and the adults at the school, both in the formal therapist/patient relationship and the informal daily interactions of the community; the use shared responsibility which was centred in regular community meetings; and the provision of experiences for pupils designed to improve pupils' self-esteem through success ("ego-building experiences"). The interviewees' retrospective perceptions of their school experience relate closely to these professed intentions, with the leavers describing feelings of satisfaction with the quality of adult-pupils relationships, the degree of "freedom" permitted to pupils and their involvement in running the community. They unanimously agreed that the school had attempted (often successfully) to give boys independence, a sense of responsibility and an understanding of and competence in the sphere of interpersonal relationships. The sample were, however, unanimously dissatisfied with the school's educational arrangements, which they felt placed insufficient

pressure on them to achieve academic success. In relation to the criteria outlined above, the researchers rated 17% of the boys as exhibiting a "poor" outcome, by showing evidence (in interview and official records) of personality disorder, or long term relationship difficulties or criminality; 28% showed a history of such problems since leaving the school, but no current problems, whilst 38% of the boys had achieved a "good" outcome, with no evidence of any of these problems currently or since leaving the school.

The studies by Laslett and, particularly, Lampen and Neill are of special interest because they take account of an area universally ignored by the pioneers, namely the pupils' perceptions of their residential experience. This is a topic which has been explored by few writers. Only Dawson (1984, 1985) has so far published an account of systematic research which takes account of the perceptions held by pupils attending residential (EBD) schools, of their schools (Laslett's, and Lampen and Neill's studies were, it will be recalled, based on *former* pupils' *retrospective* accounts). Dawson (1984) studied 86 boys attending 3 day (EBD) and 3 residential (EBD) schools. He employed a questionnaire which required pupils to indicate their agreement with a number of statements designed to elicit pupils' perceptions of their teachers' "support" and "strictness". Dawson found the highest levels of agreement (75%) with the following statements:

staff [at this school] go out of their way to help boys
boys usually talk to staff if they have a personal problem
staff try to do something about boys' complaints
staff encourage boys to talk about their feelings

In a second report of further questionnaire findings using the same sample, Dawson (1985) found equally positive responses to items relating to the pupils' perceptions of their fellow pupils and school satisfaction. Whilst 85% of pupils agreed that boys at their schools often lost their tempers with one another, 91% believed that if a boy was upset the other boys would help him. 88% thought their schools to be "friendly", 67% thought that the boys were "proud of their school", whilst 74% believed that most of the boys worried if their school got a bad name.

Dawson's findings are of interest because they present a picture of EBD pupils' perceptions of their special school surroundings which bears strong similarities with other studies. Lampen and Neill (1985), and Laslett (1985), as we have already noted, found that pupils from residential schools had very positive views of their experiences for the most part. Carnell (1983) found in a study of 92 pupils from a variety of (unspecified) special educational provision, that they favoured teachers who displayed "good teaching skills", "patience", "a sense of humour", were able "to encourage the building up of friendships", were "sympathetic", "understanding" and had the "ability to communicate". Dain (1977), Galwey (1979) and Swailes (1979), in studies of a number of off-site units for EBD children found high levels of satisfaction among the pupils which were related to the high quality of the personal relationships they enjoyed with the staff in the units. These findings also provide a useful juxtaposition to the findings of Woods (1976, 1984), Tattum (1982), and Davies (1984) that disruptive pupils often cite the humourlessness and disrespectful

treatment they receive from their mainstream teachers as motivating disruptive behaviour.

Another area which has been of recent interest to those concerned with residential schools (EBD) is that of parental and family involvement in schools. The present writer conducted a small scale study of parents' perceptions of a residential school (EBD) (Cooper, 1985). The survey indicated that there was a high level of support, among the parents who responded to the postal questionnaire, for the school and its aims. Improvements observed in the behaviour of children were attributed to the treatment programme set up by the school. However, the disappointing response rate to the questionnaire leaves the views of a majority of parents unaccounted for. Upton et al. (1986) conducted a survey of the extent of parental and family involvement in 236 residential schools in England and Wales. They found surprisingly high levels of parental and family involvement, but found little stress on the importance of this in the officially stated policies of the schools. Articles by Burland (1986), and Street and Treacher (1986), report on the policies and practices of specific schools in the area of family involvement. Both stress the importance of family involvement as both an aid to the rehabilitation of the child and the restoration of the family unit, two elements which these writers believe to be often inextricably linked. Burland, in particular, describes the importance of maintaining a continuous treatment programme (of an essentially behaviourist orientation) both at school and home.

The concerns of these recent researchers reflect the now long held recognition of the fact that residential schools must not operate in a

vacuum. They also show something more of the methodology and techniques which are employed in such schools. This latter feature has the important effect of showing us that it is not only the charismatic qualities of the pioneers which made their work so (apparently) successful (Laslett, 1983).

The fact remains, however, that the major flaw with the research so far outlined is its scarcity. There is simply insufficient research evidence on which to base an evaluation of the effects of residential schooling on EBD children (Topping, 1983; Galloway and Goodwin, 1979, 1987). There is, however, an equal dearth of research evidence to support the widespread effectiveness of other forms of provision for EBD pupils. There is even a growing suspicion that some of these cheaper, preferred, integrationist options may lead to the marginalization and stigmatization of even larger numbers of pupils than formerly occupied segregated provision, the only difference being that this new generation of marginalized pupils occupies a less sheltered position in the special classes and units which have sprung up in response to the 1981 Education Act (Galloway and Goodwin, 1987).

III OTHER TEXTS CONCERNED WITH RESIDENTIAL CARE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AND OTHER GROUPS, OF RELEVANCE TO THE PRESENT STUDY

In this final part of the review of literature relating to residential special schooling (EBD), the reader will be led on a brief excursion into a consideration of some of the work which has been done to establish the effects of residential care on inmate groups other than those

designated as children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. This is necessary not least because it is in this arena, outside the education field, where the debate concerning residential care and treatment is most active, and where some of the more imaginative applications and implications of residential care are being explored. Also, as Millham (1987) points out, research relating to school-age children in local authority care ~~may~~ have considerable relevance for an understanding of the EBD child in a residential school.

Erving Goffman's (1961) seminal study of the social world of "total institutions" has been a major influence on many of the writers who have chosen to explore this area over the past 27 years. Goffman describes the way in which total institutions (ie. institutions which place major limits on inmates' contact with the outside world and substitute functions experienced by individuals in the outside world with institutionalized forms) strip away the personal identity of inmates and have a dehumanizing effect on inmates. The process of becoming an inmate in an asylum, prison or other total institution, is marked, according to Goffman, by a relentless succession of rituals which have the cumulative effect of depriving the individual of the rights and social considerations normally accorded to a citizen in western societies. The individual must successfully adapt to these deprivations or suffer negative consequences in the form of punishment or further deprivation. Successful adaptation demands at least partial public acceptance of these 'deprivations', 'mortifications' and 'defilements'. An essential feature of Goffman's study is that he sees the organizational patterns and the demands these make on staff as leading to the development of a staff view which defines

inmates in non-human 'objectified' terms: inmates become the 'inanimate' objects which are both the 'material' and the 'products' of the work. Inmates are valued most highly by staff when they offer least resistance or inconvenience in the processes which the staff are employed to carry out. Inmates who are docile and easily manipulated (both physically and mentally) are often valued more highly than those who are critical and individualistic. In short, Goffman suggests that long term experience of a total institution leads to the development of self-images and patterns of behaviour which undermine the inmate's ability to function effectively in the world outside of the institution.

We find the concerns raised by Goffman reappearing in a number of studies of residential care across a range of facilities and clients groups, including: adolescents in approved schools (Dunlop, 1974; Millham et al., 1975), children in residential institutions for the handicapped (Tizard et al., 1975; Oswin, 1978; Shearer, 1980), adolescents in secure provision (Millham et al., 1978) and adults in long stay hospitals (Miller and Gwynne, 1972; Ryan and Thomas, 1980). Each of these writers focuses, at least in part, on the negative and dehumanizing experiences which they observe their target groups to suffer in residential settings. Tizard et al. (1975) and Oswin (1978) in studies of children in residential care, present evidence which underlines the absence of the provision of primary experiences on which children depend for healthy social and emotional development. Shearer (1980) documents over 40 years of public concern with the standards of residential care for handicapped children in our society. She reports that the 1946 Curtis Report identified 4 major areas of

deficiency in the examples of residential care of handicapped children observed by the committee; these were:

in the degree of affection, care, personal interest and understanding shown by staff to children;

the degree of stability and continuity in the residential careers of the children;

the opportunities made available to the children to "make the best of themselves";

the homeliness of the residential environments.

Shearer quotes the 1976 Court Report to show the poor progress made in achieving the aims outlined by the Curtis committee. The Court report complains of the over use of hospital placements for mentally handicapped children: a setting criticized for its failure to meet the social and emotional needs of children.

Oswin (1978) focuses specifically on children in long stay hospitals, and concludes from her research that such institutions are often understaffed, inadequately resourced, with poor standards of hygiene and physical care. The children are socially isolated from their non-hospitalized peers and lack contact with the staff. What contact patients do have with staff is limited to 1 hour in 10, which is taken up with "body servicing" (ie. washing and feeding etc.). Oswin's conclusions are consistent with Goffman's: the residential experience, for these children, amounts to one of multiple deprivation which acts as an additional difficulty for children who are already handicapped.

Ryan and Thomas (1980) explore the political implications of society's treatment of mentally handicapped individuals. They make similar

observations to those of Shearer and Oswin in their report of the deprivation to which patients are subjected in hospitals for the mentally handicapped. There is, however, in their research an image of deprivation which is of a greater magnitude and severity to that described by Shearer and Oswin. Ryan and Thomas see the emphasis of such hospitals to be on control as opposed to care. They see the hospitals as serving a custodial purpose in a society which chooses to exclude potentially disruptive and unproductive members on the grounds of medically defined "mental deficiency", a condition which can be used to deprive individuals of the rights to participation in community life, family life, work and education.

The need to preserve the fundamental human rights of individuals who find themselves labelled as delinquent, as having special educational needs, physical or mental handicap, has been a recurrent theme. It is a theme which is of particular relevance in the residential field, since it is here where, traditionally, the more extreme bearers of such labels have found themselves placed. It is a theme which unites the thinking of the early residential pioneers with modern social and educational theorists. Whilst evidence has been accumulated which reveals the ways in which human dignity and rights are denied in residential settings, some recent writers have shown also the way in which the residential experience, when it makes central to its purpose the need to observe the humanity and fundamental rights of its inmates, and even extend the inmates' understanding and practice of such rights, can enrich rather than diminish the individual's social competence and self concept.

In support of the ideas of many of the residential pioneers, writers studying the old approved schools, in their final years before their abolition under the terms of the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act, whilst finding many examples of order oriented, impersonalized and punitive establishments also found a relatively small group of more progressive institutions where there was a strong emphasis on the social and affective needs of inmates, which were often met through good staff-inmate relationships, in which the stress was placed on the need for support, guidance and mutual respect, and close involvement of inmates in decision making within the residential community and in relation to their personal situations. Dunlop (1974) found in a study of 470 boys from 9 approved schools, that reconviction rates were lowest and former inmates' perceptions of their schools were most positive amongst those pupils who had attended approved schools where the regimes combined an emphasis on trade training with good quality staff-inmate relationships. Millham et al. (1975) found, in their study of 18 approved schools, that the 'traditional' custody oriented schools were least satisfactory in eliciting inmate commitment to the official regime and its aims, and in terms of personal outcomes for inmates as measured by reconviction rates and measures of social adjustment. Those more progressive schools, however, which placed a heavy stress on inmates' affective needs, and employed organizational patterns which 'fragmented' the delinquent inmate culture (by providing opportunities for personal development and achievement within the official regime) were associated with more positive measures of outcome.

This theme is developed further by a consideration of one of the extremes in the child care system, namely secure provision. Accounts by Cawson and Martell (1979) and Millham et al. (1978) present a damning picture of this sector. Cawson and Martell describe the children they observed in such facilities as having been "rejected by the child care service" (p.228), and being the victims of a service which encourages "the perpetuation of myths about 'diagnosis', 'treatment' or 'cure' at the expense of 'care'". The writers also deplore

the justification of a control or containment decision in therapeutic terms - a practice we deplore when it happens on the other side of the Iron Curtain - and the use of therapeutic euphemisms which indicated unwillingness to face the reality that children were being locked up for extended periods, occasionally in solitary confinement. (p.229)

This use of the medical model as a form of mystification behind which the true aims of the secure units - to control and contain - are hidden is also recognized by Millham et al. (1978), who describe the secure units as often a staging post for children who, upon gaining adult status, move into the prison system. Millham et al., however, do point to some examples of positive practice in this field, and single out residential institutions which deal with severely disturbed youngsters, in both 'open' and 'closed' settings under regimes which place a genuine emphasis on care and development, as opposed to containment.

This alternative approach to secure provision is most effectively described by Hoghugh (1978). He provides an account of the work he supervises at Aycliffe School. In this account Hoghugh draws particular

attention to the social and emotional deprivation which often characterizes the home backgrounds of the severely disturbed pupils who attend the school. It is an appreciation of these features which provides one of the cornerstones for the treatment programme at Aycliffe. This is the importance of providing an environment which relieves the children of those personal family stresses, by creating an atmosphere of support and acceptance in which pupils can gradually come to terms with their own motivations.

The extremes of residential care can be expressed, on one side in terms such as 'custodial', 'body servicing' and 'dehumanizing', and on the other as 'enriching', 'supportive' and 'therapeutic'. Miller and Gwynne (1972) see the dichotomy as existing between those institutions adopting a 'warehousing' approach, and those offering a 'horticultural' approach; the one simply contains inmates and may even permit deterioration, whilst the other encourages growth and development. The latter can only occur when the 'inmate' is defined in terms of his own individuality, as a human being with specific rights, personal purposes and potentialities. It is this view which has been repeatedly aired by modern writers on this subject. Central to this point of view is the need to involve the 'consumer' of the residential service (ie. the 'inmate') in planning his/her involvement with residential services (Clough, 1982; Wagner, 1988). It is one of the main contentions of the Wagner Report that the residential services should form part of a continuum of support for individuals in the community, and thus, lose something of their exclusive 'totality'. Residential care should be seen as a means of serving the needs of the family and the individual, through supplementing normal family care, and, when appropriate, offering a

temporary substitute for family care, or even an alternative to family care (Davis, 1981). Furthermore, residential care for children is being seen increasingly as a preferred alternative to fostering (Potter, 1986; Jervis, 1988) which serves the interests of child and family better than the often threatening and confusing situations which fostering can engender. This is not to say that residential care is without its flaws.

Millham et al. (1986) have shown how the removal of children from their families and their placement in either foster or residential settings can lead to the further disintegration of family networks which are already under stress and are sometimes already partially fragmented. As has already been noted, solutions to such problems are being sought in the area of greater consumer involvement (Millham et al., 1986; Wagner, 1988). The 'consumer' is here seen not simply as the 'inmate' but all of those in the social network served by the residential provision (ie. the family of the inmate). This point seems to bring us back to where this chapter started, with a consideration of openness and freedom in the residential setting; the need for those in residence to discover and express their needs freely, as well as the need for those needs to be respected and acted upon, and for these rights to be extended to those outside the residential setting who are important to the positive development of the resident. Some tentative steps have been taken in this area. Whitaker et al. (1984) studied the perspectives held by care givers, children in residential care and their parents, of the residential experience. The researchers found that these different members of the network surrounding each child often held conflicting and, at times, contradictory perceptions of the purposes, nature and outcomes of the residential situation. This led the researchers

to question the notion of 'success' in social work and to propose a model which attempts to take account of the complexities of the child's social network.

CONCLUSION

What we are left with, after this fairly detailed survey of the relevant literature on the effects of residential schooling and residential provision in general, is a relatively clear picture of the potentialities, both positive and negative, of the residential experience. We cannot fail to be impressed with the zeal and humanitarian insight of the "pioneers". The notion of a community which is designed to build and strengthen pupils' self-images and levels of self-esteem, where values of equality, tolerance, mutual care and shared responsibility underpin the routines and structures which govern the institution, represents an educational ideal that few would reject. We do not have to accept the psychodynamic explanations of EBD which informed these practitioners, in order to accept the validity of their work. We can draw on writings of those who represent a wide range of theoretical positions for support for the values and methods espoused by these pioneers, such as (for example) the institutional determinism of Reynolds and Sullivan (1979) or Rutter et al. (1979), the Marxist perspective represented by Sharp and Green (1975) or Willis (1978), the interactionism of Woods (eg. 1984), or Tattum (1982), and the learning theory of Barnes (1976) and Rogers (1978). On the other hand, there is powerful research based anti-residential lobby, which has consistently underlined the validity of Goffman's (1961) work on total institutions.

Once again, we could call upon the same wide range of perspectives to support Goffman's contentions, either as the intended or unintended outcomes of institutional life, which may or may not relate to certain orientations in society. We have shown that there is - albeit limited - research evidence to support both perspectives in the residential field. With regard to residential schooling for EBD pupils, the research material appears to avoid consideration of the Goffmanesque dimension. The present study, therefore, will attempt to evaluate the effects of residential schooling on EBD pupils through the lenses of these two contrasting perspectives on residential provision.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RESEARCH APPROACH

TO

CASE STUDIES OF TWO RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS (EBD)

In the preceding chapters of this study arguments have been explored which suggest that the environment can be instrumental in both causing and alleviating EBD. Major benefits of the residential setting, it has been argued, are that it provides respite from the harmful pressures of the home environment, and necessary recovery periods for strained interpersonal relationships. Further important advantages described by the advocates of residential care and schooling, are that it provides children with positive adult models and a stable supportive environment which aids the resolution of personal difficulties, by offering opportunities for self analysis and counselling. A vital thread running through all of the therapeutic programmes discussed in the previous chapter is the importance of the individual's personal responsibilities toward the community of which he/she is a part. It is through the exercise of these responsibilities that central psychological and interpersonal difficulties can arise and be tackled.

The lack of research evidence in support of the claims made by the advocates of residential treatment has often been cited by those who

oppose segregated provision for SEN pupils (eg. Topping, 1983; Galloway and Goodwin, 1979). Further doubts concerning the value of a wide range of residential care facilities is provided by Millham et al. (1975, 1978), Oswin (1978), Shearer (1980), Miller and Gwynne (1972) and Ryan and Thomas (1980). These writers (whose work is outlined above) employ analytical concepts in their research which owe a great deal to the work of Goffman (1961) on 'Total Institutions'. The essence of Goffman's thesis (dealt with more fully in the introduction to this work) is that it is a tendency of 'Total Institutions' to dehumanize their inmates by subordinating their human needs to the organizational needs of the institution.

The present study is an attempt to find out what the effects of residential schooling are on a particular group of children attending such schools. In addressing this question it is necessary to establish the relevance of the analytical concepts provided by the advocates of residential care, such as the pioneer workers in this field, as well as those of Goffman and other critics of residential care. In order to do this, answers to the following questions will be sought:

What patterns of organizational features exist in such schools?

How might staff-inmate relationships be characterized in such institutions?

What forms of inmate adaptation do such institutions engender?

To what extent, if any, do these experiences contribute to the resolution of pupils' perceived emotional and behavioural difficulties?

The methods chosen by the writer to find answers to these questions are dealt with in the following section.

RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.

1. APPROACH

Two major areas were selected as a focus for this research:

1. The pupils' perceptions of their school and own situations.
2. The official policy of the school attended by the pupils.

In making the pupils' perceptions the primary focus of the research, the writer is acknowledging the fact that central to any people-processing organization's (and schools in particular) aims, is the intention to provide clients with specific experiences, with a view to affecting certain changes in the individual. The individual's reactions to the experiences he/she has in such an organization are very much dependant on the nature of these experiences as they are perceived by the client. It is also important to establish the official policy of such organizations, since this is where official aims are declared. The official aims may or may not be those which are pursued by the actors within the organization; knowledge of the participants' perceptions will help to clarify this. This need to understand the organization from the participants' viewpoint also demands a consideration of the staff view. Owing to the limitations of space, however, staff perceptions have received only very limited coverage.

The first reason for seeking pupils' views of their schools then, is the pragmatic one: schools set out to provide experiences for pupils, with a view to influencing their attitudes, understanding and behaviour. The second reason for adopting this approach is a theoretical one, which embodies a particular approach to defining the nature of everyday reality, and specific methods of inquiry into this reality. The particular approach referred to is the interactionist perspective as described in the theoretical works of Berger (1966) and Berger and Luckmann (1966), and as operationalized in the research of writers such as Hargreaves (1967), Hargreaves, Hester and Mellor (1975), Sharp and Green (1975) and Willis (1978). Before providing precise details of the present research methodology, it is necessary to explore this approach more fully, in order to establish its particular relevance to the present topic of study.

Researchers employing the interactionist perspective take the view, in varying degrees, that in order to understand the nature of a particular social situation it is necessary to ascertain the perceptions of that situation held by participants within it. In extreme forms this perspective rejects traditional structural functionalist approaches to the study of society (eg: Parsons, 1951) which argue that the individual's actions are determined by external forces in the society and can thus be viewed in the same way that the subject matter of natural science is studied. Interactionists distinguish between the observed behaviour of individuals and the actions they intentionally perform on the basis of the actors' definitions of reality (Schutz, 1967). Through this perspective, social structures are seen to be born out of a sharing of particular definitions of reality among individuals, therefore, social reality cannot

be considered as being distinct from the perceptions of reality held by the social participants. Social scientists, then, who ignore the data of such perceptions and merely observe behaviour will only record their own definition of the situation, which may or may not coincide with that of the participants.

The interactionist perspective, because of its concern with the motives and attitudes of individuals, takes the micro level of day to day situations as its focus of interest and attempts to illuminate the effects of individuals' attitudes and beliefs on social outcomes. Keddie (1971), for example, has shown how teachers of a supposedly "undifferentiated" humanities course in fact presented a differentiated course to their pupils which was stratified in accordance with assumptions that the teachers' hold about their pupils' ability and motivational levels. The teachers of Keddie's study stated that they prepared work more carefully for higher ability classes and presented it with greater intellectual rigour than they did for lower ability classes, in spite of the fact that all the pupils were entered for the same CSE examination. Similarly, Sharp and Green (1975) have shown, on the basis of non-participant observation and interviews with staff, how the rhetoric of the "child-centred" approach presented in the Plowden Report (1967) can be used to mask a system of social stratification within a primary school which takes the form of teachers giving greater attention to pupils who share their own orientations with regard to the educational value of particular activities. The pupils of the lower stratum were also more likely to be defined as "maladjusted" by the teachers, largely because of a gulf of non-communication which separated middle class teachers from working class

pupils, a gulf accentuated by the teachers' interpretation of Plowden principles, such as 'busyness'. Hargreaves et al. (1975) have also shown how the assumptions and attitudes of teachers (among other factors) can influence the development of deviant identities: to either promote or arrest their development.

The practical value of such research in sensitizing teachers to the effects on pupil's careers of certain unexamined assumptions that they may hold is clear, and this is a powerful antidote to the fatalism of structural functionalist arguments which dominate the early history of the sociology of education. This is not to say, necessarily, that schools in themselves can be leading instruments of social change in the revolutionary manner proposed by Freire (1972). The negotiated meanings of preceding generations can become restraints on existing generations in that they take the form of unquestioned "recipes" (Schutz 1967) of actions governing the interactions of particular situations. Such "recipes" can become deeply ingrained to the extent of representing incontrovertible laws of nature to those who have internalized them, regardless of the effect, detrimental or otherwise, on their adherents (Berger and Luckman, 1966). The ultimate official rejection of the Braehead (Mackenzie, 1970) and Risinghill (Berg, 1968) experiments can be viewed, perhaps, as the failure of those within the schools to take full account of the extent to which those "recipes" which they attempted to deconstruct were ingrained in the wider society as represented by the news media and the educational authorities concerned. It is, therefore, with the possibilities for structural change at the micro level and the restraints of the macro level in mind that the present writer approaches this research.

There has been a recent upsurge in interest in applying certain sociological perspectives to the field of special education, (Ford, Mongan and Whelan, 1982; Tomlinson, 1982; Barton and Tomlinson, 1981; Barton and Tomlinson, 1984). These writings have raised important questions and challenged some of the taken for granted assumptions that underpin the practice and administration of special education. These studies have tended to employ structuralist perspectives and have stressed the way in which special education can be seen as an instrument of social control serving the needs of the mainstream schools to be rid of disruptive influences (Tomlinson, 1982; Ford et al., 1982), as well as the requirements of certain status groups within society, such as educational psychologists and teachers, for consolidation or furtherance of their status positions. Much of this work (with the exception of Ford et al., 1982) has been based on and accompanied by interactionist research which attempts to illuminate the perspectives held by the various participants in a variety of situations in the special education context, from the process by which individuals are to acquire the label of having "special need" (Tomlinson, 1981; Sewell, 1981; Rowitz & Gunn, 1984), through to the experience of living with such an identity (Atkinson, Shore and Rees, 1981; Bogdan and Kugelmass, 1984; Hurst, 1984; Goode, 1984). So far, however, this approach has not been extended to a study of the experience of residential schooling for pupils designated as having "special needs" in the area of emotional and behavioural difficulties.

The most extensive study of the nature and effects of boarding schools on pupils was that carried out by Lambert (1975), which omitted special schools from its sample. The study is, however, of some interest

in the present context because although the research method was grounded essentially in "systems" theory, the researchers took considerable account of the informal order of the school and employed techniques (techniques associated more strongly with interactionist research) of participant and non-participant observation as well as in-depth interviews with staff and pupils. An extremely valuable by-product of Lambert's research was the detailed pupil perspectives on boarding school life which formed an integral part of the main research project and were presented in a separate volume (Lambert and Millham, 1968). A study of 18 approved schools for boys was also undertaken, to assess the effects of boarding on delinquent adolescents, by members of Lambert's research team (Millham, Bullock and Cherrett, 1975). Much less consideration was given to the boys' perspectives in this research, however, with this aspect being dealt with by questionnaire rather than interview.

In the area of special education, studies of the nature and effects of residential provision are few and tend to be dominated by the medical model which sees the effects of residential "treatment" in terms of "cure" or "remission" (Balbernie, 1966; Tizard, Sinclair and Clarke, 1975) and have consequently, tended to be studies of "behaviour" as opposed to "action" (see above). Recently, a survey for the Schools Council into provision for disturbed pupils, (Dawson, 1980) which was followed up by brief visits to schools, including some residential establishments, and short observation sessions, led to a comprehensive study of the nature of educational provision for disturbed pupils (Wilson & Evans, 1980). Again, however, the research technique demanded by the task of studying 263 schools has meant that little detailed information has been produced on the

detailed perceptions held pupils of their situations. The significance of these studies to the present discussion, however, has been that they have sought the perceptions of disturbed pupils as essential components in monitoring and evaluating the work of the special schools (Dawson, 1984; 1985). The means by which Dawson gathered data was to present pupils with lists of statements with which they could either agree or disagree. From a purely interactionist view point this type of data must be treated with a degree of caution since the original statements have been generated through the researcher's perspective and the significance of these statements to the pupils' view of the situation is left unknown. Thus, whilst (for example) Dawson's research indicates that 85% of the subjects agree with the statement "Boys often lost their temper with each other" (Dawson, 1985, p.22), the data carries no indication as to whether or not the pupils see this as a significant aspect of pupil behaviour or, indeed, what aspects of pupil behaviour are significant to them. These latter questions are of the type with which interactionist research deals and that are covered in the following research report. Having said this it must be remembered that studies such as this are generated from a perspective which is informed by considerable experience of work in the field. The present writer, therefore, considers such studies to be of value and makes considerable use of them in the following study.

2. METHODOLOGY

Two schools were used in this study, "Farfield" School and "Lakeside" School. Both were residential special schools, designated for

boys of secondary age with emotional and behavioural difficulties. The studies were not conducted simultaneously; the majority of the Farfield study was completed before the Lakeside study. Although this situation arose out of practical considerations, there are three valuable outcomes from conducting the study in two schools in this way:

1. A wider sample of subjects.
2. Opportunities for comparison.
3. Opportunities to explore lines of thought developed in the first study in a different setting

The Lakeside study, therefore, is a development from the Farfield study, as well as comparative study.

The two schools adhered to a broadly similar pattern, bearing many similarities with the schools run by the pioneers (see chapter 2), though, like the pioneer establishments, also possessing their own unique features. Both schools were housed in what had once been very grand country houses, set in rural locations. There were 32 children on roll at Lakeside and 45 at Farfield. The officially espoused policy of both schools was to treat pupils along therapeutic lines. Both schools were non-maintained: Lakeside being run as a charitable trust, whilst Farfield held independant status. The two schools accepted only those pupils who were referred to them by local authorities. Local authorities paid the fees of all pupils. Farfield school had a considerably higher per capita income than Lakeside owing to the higher level of fees charged; this is still true when the fact is taken into account that Farfield offered 52

week a year provision for some pupils, whilst Lakeside operated only during school terms.

The two schools, therefore, offer important points of similarity as well as interesting differences, which allow for a full consideration of the three aims mentioned above. More detailed descriptions of each school will be presented later.

Three research tools were selected for the accumulation of data:

1. Participant/non-participant observation.
2. Tape recorded interviews.
3. Self completed questionnaires.

The writer was in his third year of teaching at Farfield school at the time of the research (January - April, 1985). During the period of the research, however, he attended the school outside of his duty hours in order to observe and interact with pupils and staff. The participant observation, therefore, not only involved teaching the children and the fulfilment of residential duties, but also much less formalized contact with, in particular, the pupils. The Lakeside study was different in the sense that the researcher was known only to the pupils and staff as a researcher, and not as a teacher. Participant observation at Lakeside, therefore, included much informal contact with staff and pupils as an important means of developing the rapport necessary to research of this kind. Such contact included game playing (pool, table-tennis) and casual conversation. Informal contact with the staff at Lakeside was more

difficult to arrange, and tended to consist of casual conversation in the staffroom.

Although the writer spent time observing all of the pupils in both schools it was decided to concentrate the research on older pupils, aged 14 and over. This is because such pupils tended to have relatively lengthy experience of these schools, as well as significant experience of comprehensive schools, which form an important element in the analytical framework upon which this study is based. Also, by and large, the older pupils seemed to have better developed critical responses to their situations than the younger pupils, which they expressed often with great clarity and depth of perception.

A total of 28 boys were chosen as the focus for this study (15 from Farfield and 9 from Lakeside). These pupils were subjected to lengthy tape recorded interviews, and each filled in two questionnaires. The interviews were organized around a number of broad themes rather than a formal schedule of questions, the intention being to elicit the pupils' perceptions of the situation. The interview data forms the major part of the research, and is presented in some detail in the following sections of the thesis.

The questionnaires (see appendix I) were designed to introduce a more structured and quantifiable element into the study, and were constructed after the initial analysis of the interview data in order to test some of the conclusions drawn from the data, and to impose a uniform research instrument on the two schools. The questionnaires were presented

to a wider sample in each school, in order to test the degree to which the interview findings could be seen to be representative of the wider pupil group (A total of 57 pupils returned the second, more refined questionnaire, out of a combined total of 77 pupils in the two schools). For this reason the questionnaires are analyzed in a separate section (chapter 6) after the interview data from the two fieldwork institutions. It must be stressed, however, that the writer sees the interview data as being the most important source of information. It is only through such data that anything approaching an accurate reconstruction of the individuals' view of their experience can be made. The questionnaire data is essentially an extension of this primary reconstruction.

The form which the presentation of the data takes is also dictated by the intention to represent an accurate picture of the pupils' perceptions of their schools. To this end the Farfield and Lakeside studies have been presented as two separate case studies, which are drawn together through the presentation of the questionnaire data and in a following chapter (chapter 7). This form of presentation also reflects the research process as undergone in the present study, thus allowing the reader to follow and criticize the analytical aspects of the study.

Whilst the focus of the research was pupils' perceptions of their situations, it was also necessary to devote some consideration to the perceptions of staff, since their attitudes and behaviour make a major contribution to the school setting. It is of course, however, the pupils' perceptions of staff behaviour which are a more powerful influence on pupil attitudes and behaviour than staff intentions. For this reason, as well as

the need to limit the scope of the present enquiry, only very brief attention was paid to the matter of staff perceptions in the main text. This attention was restricted to two brief questionnaires which sought to elicit staff perceptions of the purpose and effects of their schools. These questionnaires were returned by 12 of the Farfield staff and only 2 of the Lakeside staff. Because this data is seen as being of a supplementary nature, in relation to the study, it is reported as an appendix to the present thesis (appendix IV).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE FARFIELD STUDY

The study was carried out at "Farfield School", a residential school for boys set in a rural location in the West Midlands, which provides accommodation for pupils for 52 weeks per year, when required. The school is independent, having been established in April 1981, and therefore, having been open for 4 years at the time of this study. The school is surrounded by countryside (1½ miles from the centre of the nearest town, ½ mile from the nearest concentration of housing) but covers a relatively small site. (less than 2 acres). The site is dominated by a large Georgian house which contains all the sleeping accommodation, kitchen, dining rooms, games rooms, administrative office, staffroom and one classroom. There are 11 bedrooms which include 2 staff "sleeping-in rooms". At the very top of the house is a self-contained flat in which there are 3 of the bedrooms with accommodation for 6 boys. The flat is intended "to be used to equip boys with the necessary skills to cope with independence/semi-independence" (school document). The flat also contains a classroom and one of the staff "sleeping-in" rooms. The sleeping accommodation is divided into "junior" and "senior" dormitories, placement in which is largely dependent upon age, though social and physical factors are also considered, according to staff. On the ground floor are located the staff common room, dining room, kitchen, school office, 2 pupil common rooms ("junior" and "senior", again) and the games area. The games area is a large open space which occupies the central ground floor area and

contains two 6ft pool tables and a table tennis table. The common rooms contain easy chairs and colour t.v.'s. The house is physically well kept, carpeted throughout (except for the games area, which has a polished wooden floor), clean, well decorated with fresh flowers and house plants usually in evidence. The teaching block, by way of contrast, is composed of 4 portable buildings which include: a specialist woodwork room, a specialist art room, a science/home economics room, a remedial resources room, a music room, 5 additional classrooms, the headteachers' office and boys' toilets. There is a gymnasium, and a swimming pool in an inflatable polythene housing. There is also a full-size tennis court and additional tarmac playing surface, as well as a sports field with a football pitch. Off-site (approximately 1/3 mile away from the school) is the school garden and a full size football pitch.

There are 7 full-time teachers, plus 4 part-timers. There are 8 full-time child-care staff (Residential Social Workers) including the principal plus 1 part-timer. Teaching staff also engage in extraneous duties (10 hours per week each). Additionally there is an ancilliary staff of 10 men and women. All of the teachers are qualified and recognized in accordance with D.E.S. regulations (as they stood at the time of the study), and the care staff is composed of 4 qualified teachers and 4 persons with social work qualifications, the 9th member of the staff is a social sciences graduate with no professional qualifications.

The professed aims of the school, as stated in the documents which are presented to LEA's and staff, are summed up in the following statement: (School Curriculum Document, p.1)

The school was established with the aim of providing a caring therapeutic environment in which children who were casualties of society could receive the care and attention necessary for positive development to take place. The School is designated to cater for children with behavioural, social and emotional problems, who range educationally from those children who are able to follow a curriculum parallel to mainstream schools to children with moderate learning difficulties. Within these guidelines we aim to provide a residential education for thirty nine boys of secondary school age with the overall aim of equipping them, so that within each pupil's ability, he may leave school and enter society as an actual participant. We recognise that generally speaking most pupils who are placed in the school, will probably remain with us for the whole period of their secondary education. In the spirit of Warnock however, we will in conjunction with the LEA, where possible, work towards the return of the child to his home environment, where reintegration is a viable possibility.

(School Curriculum Document, p.1)

In a second document, prepared by the headteacher for circulation among the staff, the aim of "reintegration" is stated much more forcefully:

The principle of reintegration must form our major aim [...] [where reintegration is not possible, however] we must ensure that they are equipped so that they leave with an acceptable level of personal adequacy and social competence in order that they can lead useful and active lives in society.

(Headteacher's Document, p.1).

The same document cites the following methods for achieving these aims:

- (i) a realistic and structured referral programme which ensures that both the child and the school are suitable for each other.
- (ii) a commitment from the child and his parents to support the school in its aims.
- (iii) good communications maintained with the home, social services, local LEA via 6 Weekly Reports, Termly Reports, visits and telephone calls in order to ensure a unified approach, prevent play off by the child and ensure realistic back up when needed.
- (iv) the school to meet the child's physical needs via

a warm caring, pleasant atmosphere and its emotional needs through a caring approach.

(v) the building of positive caring relationships between staff/pupils.

(vi) by meeting their educational needs.

(p.1. Headteacher's document)

A further policy document, entitled *The Residential Task*, defines the "aims" of the school in the following terms:

It is the aim of Farfield School to provide a planned and stimulating environment which gives care, control and nurture, appropriate to maintaining and promoting the emotional and physical well-being of the children in it. (p.1)

The document goes on to describe methods of care and assessment which are intended to fulfil these aims. The tone of this document is highly reminiscent of the therapeutic principles espoused by the "pioneers" (see chapter 2), in that stress is placed on the need to:

[recognize each] pupil's right to be an individual and his right to be treated not just as a human being, but as this human being with his own feelings.

His right to express feelings, especially those that are negative [...]

The need for controlled emotional involvement, to be sensitive to a child's feelings, understand their meaning and to give purposeful appropriate response to them.

To accept the child for what he really is, including strengths and weaknesses, congenial and uncongenial qualities, positive and negative feelings [...] maintaining all the while his sense of innate dignity and personal worth.

[To adopt] non-judgemental attitudes.

To develop a child's self determination. To recognize his need and right to make choices and decisions. To stimulate and motivate his potential for self direction. (pp.1-2)

"Control measures" are required to take the form of "rewards and privileges rather than punishments and sanctions"; corporal punishment is strictly forbidden. A particular feature of the school organization is the use of "Key Worker" groups, whereby each RSW is responsible for the same small group of pupils (between 6 and 8), for the full term of their stay at Farfield. Key Workers' responsibilities include pastoral support of individual pupils, regular social assessment of the pupils and recording of general observations, and liaison with the families and services involved both within and outwith the residential setting. The Key Worker system is seen as a major therapeutic tool at Farfield, whereby pupils are given an optimum level of personal attention, as well as a personal reference point in the form of a particular Key Worker, and small group of peers.

It must be stressed that the aims and methods cited are the stated aims of the school as represented in official school literature; that is not to say that these are or are not the *actual* aims pursued by the school. These documents, however, represent an important starting point for the research reported below in that they provide a point of access into the world of the school via its "official" persona. It is the purpose of this piece of research to contribute to a deeper understanding of the actual aims and methods of the institution concerned.

At the time of the interviews (3-28th March, 1985) the school had 45 boys on roll, ranging in age from 10.9. to 17.8 (mean: 13.6; median: 13.5; mode: 13.3). The boys' fees were all paid by LEA's. The pupils were drawn from a variety of locations around Greater London, the Midlands and Wales. The boys were divided into "Senior" and "intermediate" (sometimes

referred to as "junior" groups. They were divided among 6 classes in school (3 classes of 8, 3 classes of 6), with 3 boys in their final year pursuing full-time work experience programmes. Classes were described by the Headteacher as being mixed ability and selected on the basis of age, social and physical characteristics.

A typical day at Fairfield starts at 7.30 with the staff and certain specified senior boys rousing pupils. This was seen to be done in a relatively calm and ordered way. The duty staff member (who has "slept in") firstly rouses enuretics and supervises them in the disposal of their linen and showering (if necessary). After washing and room tidying, pupils have breakfast between 8.00 a.m. and 8.30. At 9.45 all boys assemble in the games area, where they line up in class groups under the supervision of the duty RSW, the duty Senior and the teaching staff. The boys then walk over to the gymnasium under supervision, where a brief morning assembly takes place. Boys and staff stand for the assembly, which consists of the duty Senior giving brief notices and announcements and the group recitation of The Lord's Prayer. Pupils are then dispersed to their classes. Classes are organized on relatively formal lines. Pupils are required to attend lessons unless ill, or given particular dispensation by staff. The classrooms are equipped with carrels as well as conventional open desks. Pupils spend the first session of the day (9.00 - 10.30) with their form teachers, studying English or maths.; for the rest of the day they move as a group to different teachers for specialist subjects. On average each teacher spends between 50% and 75% of their time with their form classes; the younger age groups spending the greatest amount of time. The day is divided into eight 40 minute periods interspersed with two 15 minute breaks

(between lessons 2 and 3, and 6 and 7), and a 75 minute lunch break (between lessons 4 and 5), though pupils are often found working unsupervised in the classrooms during breaktimes. All pupils study: English, maths., science, environmental studies, computer studies, drama, music, art, woodwork, gardening, home economics, P.E. and R.E. Older pupils follow CSE courses in English, maths., art, woodwork and environmental studies. During lesson periods the school site is observed to have a quiet and calm atmosphere. The teachers have relatively formal expectations of their pupils in terms of working habits: pupils are generally found seated in class, movement from their seats and pupil talk are generally legitimate only when approved by the teacher. There is regular evidence of lively and relatively uninhibited debate in classrooms, with pupils relating to staff with respectful familiarity, which takes the form of jokes and general banter between staff and pupils. Pupils give the impression of being industrious, though signs of boredom are sometimes visible in the form of window staring and "doodling". The timetable is organized to give each class a period of P.E. everyday. This takes the form of a games session in which up to 3 classes participate together, single class P.E. sessions, and swimming sessions. School ends at 4.00 p.m. The evening is taken up with tea (5.00 p.m. to 6.00) and an activity period (6.30 - 8.00), in which duty staff provide recreational activities for between 4 and 5 groups of children; these activities include: sports and games, trips to parks and places of recreation and interest, art, and craft. Juniors go to bed after the activity period, seniors at between 9 and 10.30. Periods not accounted for are "free time", in which pupils engage in activities that are not staff supervised. Weekends and holidays tend to be less formally organized with mealtimes being flexible in

accordance with the activities that are planned by staff on a daily and weekly basis.

The purpose of the research is to provide data contributing towards an account of pupils' perceptions of their experience in a residential school for pupils with emotional and behavioural difficulties. The research method chosen was that of partially focused interview, conducted on a one-to-one basis with pupils and recorded on audio cassette tapes. Fifteen boys were interviewed, all from the "senior" (i.e. over 14) group of the school, ranging in age from 14.0 to 16.2 (mean: 15.0; median: 15.0; mode: 15.0). The interviews were all conducted outside of teaching time, in the evenings or at weekends. Pupils were also assured of anonymity and confidentiality of their contributions and were told that they were being interviewed as part of a project to assess the effects of boarding education on pupils. The interviews lasted from between 45 minutes and 3 hours depending upon the willingness of the interviewee to continue, and restrictions caused by normal school routines.

It was decided, that in order to provide a focus for the interviews and a basis for comparison between the individual texts, that the interviews be partially structured around a comparison between the school's official perceptions of its aims and methods and the pupils' perceptions of the school's aims and methods. Thus, all pupils were asked what they believed the reason for their placement to be and the purpose of their placement. They were also asked about their attitudes towards and relationships with staff and pupils, the pastoral effectiveness of staff/pupil relationships, and their involvement in decision making. Other

areas of focus were: the pupils' relationships with their families and friends at home and the effect which individual placement has had on them, the "homeliness" of the institution; the prevalence and significance of rules and restrictions. Pupils were asked to compare their present placement with their previous experience of other institutions, residential or not. Thus, where predetermined themes are explored they are based upon the school's official perceptions of itself and its purposes, and upon significant areas in the personal world of the child as defined in the school's official literature. The interviews were, however, only partially focused. In addition to the predetermined themes, which were explored in an open ended way (without a schedule of questions), the interviewees were encouraged to talk freely on any matters they felt to be of importance. For this reason the interviewer asked many additional questions which were determined in response to lines of thought suggested in the course of the conversation. The interviewees' responses were then organised under headings which were established in accordance with the topics which were discussed in the interviews, in line with an ethnographic research method. The categories to emerge from the data were as follows:

1. The pupils' overall impression of the school, including their recollections of their first experiences of the school.
2. The pupils' degree of satisfaction with the school.
3. Comparisons between the pupils' present situation and experience of other institutions and situations.
4. The pupils' relationships with other people at the school.
5. Freedom, restrictions and rules.
6. Pupils' perceptions of the reasons for their placement at the school.
7. Pupils' perceptions of the personal effects of their

placement.

It should be pointed out that the aim of the research is not to produce a statistical account of the frequency of particular attitudes to the school shared by the boys, but rather, it is an attempt to discover the range and depth of experience that the pupils' individually perceive in relation to their placement in a residential school (EBD). This does not mean, however, that the degree to which attitudes are shared is not of interest. The suggestion is, that an attitude does not have to be shared in order for it to be considered significant to the present study.

1. *Pupils' Overall Impressions of the School; Including their
Recollections of their First Experiences of the School.*

An indication of the personal significance of their first experiences of the school is provided by the clarity and detail of many of these pupils' recollections. Of the 11 boys who discussed their length of stay, 6 recalled accurately their length of stay to the nearest month, whilst 5 recalled the exact date of their arrival. Three of the latter 5 had been at the school for more than 2 years, whilst 2 had been at the school for more than one year. Three boys had experience of residential education. The pupils' recollections of their first impressions of the school are mixed, but are invariably linked with a clearly definable emotion. One pupil (Alan) complains of feeling "annoyed" at finding himself in a strange place:

I: How did you feel on the first morning, when you woke up here?

Alan: Well, it did annoy me a bit, because they didn't ask me first. Or they didn't tell me where I was going. I didn't even know where I was going. All I knew was going in the country somewhere.

This pupil's bewilderment is clearly aggravated by the fact that he feels he has been inadequately prepared for what he sees as a sudden change of environment.

Other pupils react negatively to what they feel to be an alien environment. Six pupils complain of initial home sickness. Lewis, a 16 year old boy of West Indian extraction, looks back to the early days of his

22 month stay at the school and provides an account of his early difficulties:

I: Can you tell me how you felt, when you first came here?

Lewis: Well, I suppose I felt like a lot of other kids. When you're first away from home it's not exactly the best place to be [...] I hadn't been away from home before, so it made it hard for me. I felt caged-in: as if I did anything wrong I'd get done for it.

I: Why was that, do you think?

Lewis: I dunno. I just weren't used to a place with so many kids there. And sleeping with kids you don't know - that don't exactly feel right to me [...] I think you should really have a room of your own, until you get used to knowing the kids: what they are like and who they are. If you know what I mean. So that is one thing that I didn't like about it. But after a while I got used to it. I didn't like having to shower with kids that I'd never known, and that felt bad towards me [...] It was so far away from home an' all. The only way you could talk to someone was on the 'phone. And when I did that it made me feel worse anyway [...] I felt weird with the town and that.

I: Why was that then?

Lewis: Just all different. And that I was the only coloured person in the town. And it made feel the odd one out.

I: Yes, the town's quite alot different from where you come from. How did you feel about that?

Lewis: It was dead. I wondered where everyone was, because there was only a few people walking down the street.

Lewis's response shows how the transition from the family home to the communal life of boarding school can be a disturbing and distasteful experience to a sensitive adolescent. When we consider, in addition to this claustrophobic communality, the feelings of isolation that are caused by the violent contrast between the boy's home, on a council estate in an overpopulated Outer London borough, and the peace and quiet of the sparsely

populated rural setting occupied by the school, as well as his racial self consciousness, we begin to appreciate the immense task of readjustment with which such children can be faced.

Whilst feelings of initial unhappiness and homesickness are mentioned by several boys (5 out of a total sample of 15), the majority of boys (10/15) describe their initial responses to the school in favourable terms. An even larger proportion of the interviewees (13/15) describe their view of the school, after their initial impressions, in favourable terms. The quality of the school's recreational activities and facilities is cited repeatedly by nearly all of the boys (14/15). One boy at once encapsulates the complex and varied feelings that can be inspired in those early days of residential schooling, and the important influence of an attractive recreational programme:

Jim: ... Mr. Talbot [the school principal] said, "It's up to the boy if he wants to come [to Fairfield School as a pupil]."

I: What did you say?

Jim: Yes!

I: As quick as that? Was it easy to make the decision?

Jim: No, it felt bad at the time, because I was leaving my family. And then it was alright after that ...

I: What did you think of the place when you first saw it?

Jim: Big [...] there was alot to do [...] I thought it was going to be a bad place. When he [Mr. Talbot] says, "you go to Butlins' and Spain [annual school holidays]," it made me think again [...] Then when it was the day for me to come here, I got a shock a bit [...] I was scared [...] I didn't know how I'd get on with kids I'd never met before.

I: How did you feel about being away from home?

Jim: I cried a bit. I was upset.

I: How long did it take to get over that?

Jim: Until I went home, really. When I went home and came back, and went home. I was just getting less crying and that. I just get used to it now.

The tempting recreational opportunities by no means outweigh the understandable fears and difficulties faced by Jim (in common with many of his fellow pupils), they do, however, serve to quell his anxiety until he actually arrives at the school, as well as to counter some of his fears about the nature of the institution he has agreed to enter.

Ryan, a 16 year old, who had been a pupil at the school for 28 months, describes very positive first impressions of the school, which by inference echo Jim's initial fears of a hostile and impersonal institution:

[...] when I first looked round [...] I thought it was a great place [...] I thought it was really homely, 'cos when I saw Jane and all that lot [seamstresses] doing their sewing and that. And they all said, "hello." None of the kids stared me out or nothing when I come here. They all seemed alright. And the bedrooms: they seemed like the actual kids' bedrooms, and not just plain walls.

This boy's sensitivity to detail and atmosphere conveys vividly a sense of relief at finding the school to have the appearance of a comfortable and humane place, where there is a sense of peace and harmony rather than the hostility and "plain walls" that he expected.

Almost all of the boys (14/15) refer exclusively to the residential side of the school when recounting their first experiences, indicating, perhaps, that this is the area of greatest novelty, anxiety and concern. This is equally true for pupils who have come to the school

directly from their family homes, as it is, for those who have come from other residential establishments. Only one boy, Les, mentions the "privacy" of the classrooms, with their individual carrels, which he feels have helped him concentrate better on his school work.

When we come to examine the ways in which pupils' impressions of the school have developed since their initial experiences, we find the school's leisure and recreational facilities, as well as the physical character of the place, to be still significant. Improvements in these areas are cited by many pupils (11/15) as reasons for increased satisfaction with the school:

John: [...] I thought it was going to be crap, but since about six months ago it was alright.

I: So when you first came here you didn't like it.

John: No.

I: Why not?

John: I dunno. 'Cos it was boring in the bedroom. 'Cos at home I had a telly in the bedroom; games and everything [...] like "Space Invaders".

[...]

I: Were you more bored here than at home?

John: I was even boreder [sic] when I was at home!

I: How does the school compare with home? Where would you rather be?

John: Here [...] Because there's more things to do here than at home [...]

I: What happened to make you start liking the place six months ago?

John: All the rooms being decorated. All the tables being done. The tellies in the bedrooms. Er, loads of things [...]

Going out on trips, playing football, cricket, table tennis, tennis. That was it.

Like Ryan, John is sensitive to the physical environment, and the fact that the bedrooms have been decorated and that the dining tables have been given a more attractive appearance, clearly contribute to this boy's sense of wellbeing. His reference to sporting activities is also interesting, in that it implies a degree of successful social integration. Beyond the features of the physical environment, a significant number of boys (8/15) remark that their happiness at school has increased as the prevalence of bullying in the school has decreased, owing to the departure of certain pupils. (To what extent any of the interviewees have themselves become bullies as their oppressors leave, is discussed later). This does, however, point to the reality underlying the initial fears expressed by Jim and Ryan, and to the influence this state of affairs has on the pupils' degree of satisfaction at school.

Some pupils' initial desire to leave the school is not dispelled by the passage of time; to be passed off as a settling in problem. Malcolm, a quiet and affable 16 year old, with a history of violence against staff at his mainstream school, was interviewed on the eve of his leaving the school. He made it quite clear that he had no feelings of regret that his 27 month stay at the school was coming to an end. "I can't wait," he declared. And he went on to describe how he had wanted to leave ever since starting at the school! His complaints concern the alien environment of the school ("It's too quiet"), which he has never become used to. Interestingly, however, Malcolm admits to finding life at the

school more pleasant in the months directly preceeding his leaving, owing to a marked decline in the prevalence of bullying. Malcolm does not describe himself as a victim of bullying - it is difficult to imagine this six foot tall, muscular, physically confident young man as being bullied by anyone - but is referring to the way in which some of the younger, smaller boys have been treated by bigger boys. Malcolm, once again therefore, is commenting on the importance of the atmosphere which pervades the school, and the extent to which this influences pupils' sense of satisfaction and wellbeing.

In describing changes in their impressions of the school, a number of pupils (11/15) reveal the importance of relationships they share with staff. The pupils refer to the importance they attach to the caring attitudes of staff, and their willingness to help with personal problems. Such relationships, however, can be two edged, as 14 year old Chris remarks, after 23 months at the school:

[the school] has got better, facility wise. Some of the nice staff have left. I preferred some of the old staff to the one's we've got now.

The importance of the staff, and particularly the principal (Mr. Talbot), in influencing the quality of life at the school is commented on by Lewis and Ryan. Lewis recounts an incident in which he was placed, by the principal, in a position of responsibility over other boys, and then "set up" by the principal so that his authority was undermined. The significance of this story to Lewis lies in the feelings of betrayal he feels as a result of this experience, and the belief that his previous

closeness to and trust in the principal are no longer appropriate. This represents an interesting reversal of the conventional view of teacher-pupil relationships, in which the risk of betrayal is often seen as the teacher's rather than the pupil's (see Marland, 1975).

In a slightly different way, Ryan relates what he sees to be important changes in the school, which effect pupil satisfaction, to changes he perceives in the principal's attitudes toward the boys:

I: Has it changed much since you've been here?

Ryan: Yes, alot. Alot.

I: What sort of things?

Ryan: Well, Mr. Talbot has. I mean before he was hard. 'Cos he had to be. We had Fred and Wayne [former pupils with reputations for difficult an violent behaviour] and that lot here. Nicking going on all the time and fights. And we couldn't really smoke much, y'know; it was just certain times. And he's much more friendly now than he was before. He was like a proper headmaster before, you know, giving out rules. Now he's slackened off really [...]

I: Do you think it's as tough now for the juniors as it was for you?

Ryan: No, I don't think so. Because when Wayne and that lot were here he was hard on everyone, and now he ain't. He's a lot more friendly. I mean, sweets; these parties he's been having. Right? [...] Just on a normal weekend he'll go round and buy a load of sweets, stick it in the supper room and we'll have a special supper. On average now that's every three weeks say [...] Before, we'd be lucky if we got it any time during the year, apart from Christmas. The kids' birthday cakes used to be just something that the cook has made. Now he goes out and gets gateaux and stuff. [pause] I think he must trust the kids a lot more now, or else he wouldn't have got all the new wallpaper and stuff.

In this extract we see several interesting features. Ryan echoes points already made about the importance of certain material items (food and decoration), and the effect they have on children's sense of satisfaction. He also sheds further light on the effect which difficult and violent children may have on the lives of children who are not necessarily their victims, in a direct sense, of their terrorizing. Ryan sees the presence of such behaviour as forcing the principal's hand into imposing a strict regime, which in turn leads to a less comfortable social climate. The relaxation of the regime is the principal's choice, thus emphasising Ryan's view of the power which the principal has over the school. Another interesting point is the polarity which is suggested to exist between a "proper headmaster" who is concerned with "giving out rules" and a friendly person; there is the echo of a less than pleasant mainstream school experience suggested here.

2. *The Pupils' Degree of Satisfaction with the School.*

As we move beyond initial and generalized impressions of the school, we find pupils becoming more preoccupied with their personal situations. Whilst the material aspects of the school still figure among those aspects of the school which the pupils claim to like, we find emotional needs coming more to the fore when the pupils are asked to talk about their present state of satisfaction with the school. Having said this, for one pupil in particular the material provision is the most significant aspect. This is John again, the boy whose initially adverse reaction to the school was softened by his perception of the material quality of the establishment:

I: What are the things you like about the school?

John: I like the activities: I like the videos, I like the staff.
I like the whole school - now it's all done up.

I: You like the look of it?

John: Yes. And when I leave next year I'll be coming up after [...] just to see everybody, 'cos I'll have a job by then [...] It's a good school. It's a normal school. It's good for people. People like it here. 'cos some people hate Mr. Talbot, like Mick and Alan [other interviewees]. But - it sounds really stupid - all the things he buys for us. I dunno. They're just thick! He bought us tellies: he gives us sweets at nighttime. He gives us free fags. He gives us everything.

John gets considerable emotional satisfaction out of the school and he likes being there. He enjoys "activities" (recreational pursuits that are

provided by staff at weekends and in the evenings), he likes the staff and he enjoys the facilities. What at first might seem to be an over emphasis on the material aspects of the school, can also be seen as a straightforward acknowledgement of the extent to which well cared for and well resourced surroundings can reflect a sense of care and value (cf. Bettelheim, 1955; Rose, 1978). Because the school is well resourced and the principal perceived to be generous John feels valued and cared for. Of further interest here is the reference to the school principal as being central to this boy's perception of the school, which echoes Ryan's comments from the previous section.

An opposing view of the relationship between material provision and caring is provided by Ryan. Ryan looks beyond the material perks of school life and searches for motives, and in doing so reveals personal insight and sensitivity tinged with cynicism:

[...] To tell the truth, I reckon, myself, that he [Mr. Talbot] don't give a shit about us. It's just his name [...]. He'll do anything in his power, right, to have the mums thinking good of him, to have the authorities thinking good of him; to have his friends thinking good of him, and to have the people down town thinking good of him. That's why he gets us these clothes. When he says he's buying us trousers, right, he ain't buying us no trousers. Say he buys you a pair of shoes right. "Oh," everyone says. "Mr. Talbot bought me a pair of shoes! Great, innit?" You know what he does? He gets the receipt and puts it in the petty cash [ie. in order to reclaim what he has spent from school funds] [...]. He don't pay for no extra clothes. I don't reckon one thing comes out of his own pocket in this place. My old dear hated him [...]. She thinks he just does everything for his name [...]. Every time he gives us something, I can't help thinking, "is he doing this because he likes me, or is he doing this so I go home and tell my mum he got me this?"

I. So in a way, you don't really trust him?

R. Well, I can't trust him [...] [pause] I trust him, yeah, to keep a secret. But I don't really trust him to keep a secret, come to think of it! I mean, I can tell him something not to tell anyone, but he'll tell all the staff, and he'll tell Lewis [another pupil and friend of Ryan's] and all [...] I don't talk to the geezer about things [...] I talk to Mr. Harris [Ryan's key worker].

Ryan feels suspicious of the principal's motives. The extra material provision is seen as merely a means of manipulating the boys in order to secure a good personal reputation for the principal. Ryan feels uncertain and insecure because he believes that the principal is deceiving him. This view of the material benefits of the school provides an interesting contrast to the view provided by John. A further point of interest is Ryan's indication that he is able to trust his key worker with personal matters, which would suggest some degree of compensation for the lack of trust he has in the principal. It must also be noted, however, that Ryan's 'evidence' for his claim that the principal "don't give a shit about us", is rather thin: that the principal does not buy clothing for the pupils out of his own pocket, is hardly indicative of an uncaring attitude. The confusion which underlies Ryan's view, however, is perhaps not entirely unfounded: John also relates the material provision of the school with the personal generosity of the principal, leading one to wonder whether in fact this is an impression the principal encourages.

It is in social and personal aspects of their lives that the majority of pupils seek satisfaction at the school. It is repeatedly stated (13 out of 15 pupils), that pupils like the school because teachers at the school are more helpful in class than teachers they have known

before (12/15); this applies equally to pupils who have spent time in residential establishments. The friendliness of other pupils is also mentioned by some interviewees (6/15). A 15 year old boy who has been at the school for 10 months, Dave, speaks repeatedly of the opportunities that he has for "having a laugh" with other boys at the school. The same expression is used by Malcolm (the reluctant pupil, referred to above, who is due to leave the day following the interview). Both of these boys admit to having histories of anti-social behaviour and of being extremely unhappy in their previous institutions. Alex, a 15 year old who has spent 12 months at the school, praises the school for the "good" it has done him. He says he is happy there, though he admits to preferring to be at home with his family, and attributes his happiness to the fact that he is surrounded, at the school, by pupils who share similar problems to his own:

Alex: [...] There's people here with the same problems as me, isn't there? [...] Like, some have got problems and that. Like my family - a couple or more people have got them. You know you're not the only one.

I: Is that a good or bad thing?

Alex: It's a good thing!

I: Why's that then?

Alex: Because, you can think, "it ain't just me it's happening to; it's happening to a lot more people.

I: Do you ever talk to each other about your problems?

Alex: Well, very small things.

Alex takes comfort from the knowledge that his is not an isolated case. This may help to explain, also, why Dave and Malcolm find it possible to "have a laugh" at this school, whereas previously they were unable to do so. For some boys then, the school can be seen as a sort of sanctuary, where they are known and accepted for things which make them feel isolated outside the school. This highlights the personal isolation that can be felt by those who have been designated as being in "special need". Three pupils cite the fact that the school suits particular needs which they have as reasons for their feelings of satisfaction with the school. Fifteen year old Brian, who has extensive experience of residential special schools, says:

Brian: The teachers come and help you sometimes with your work here... You don't have to do your work straight away; you can have a talk; you can carry on with your work.

I: That didn't happen in your other schools then?

Brian: No [...] it was O.K. I thought it was too crowded. There was too many people there [...] Sometimes if there's too many people you lose out - sometimes on stuff you want to do, if there's too many people.

A fourteen year old, Jim, echoes these sentiments when he describes the school as "the right place for me" and couples this with a recognition of the value of talking to staff when he has personal problems. Greg, another fifteen year old, also finds the school more conducive to work; he says, "it's not so noisy. I get more work done." At a more general level, Colin, the sixteen year old, who claims to have spent ten years in residential schools, speaks glowingly of his present school; he feels "more free" at this school. Although he speaks highly of his present school and states

that he likes being there, he candidly admits to being "sick" of residential schools and wanting to leave:

Yeah! I'm quite happy to leave here. What I was trying to describe to you [...] if this was my first boarding school - say if I'd just come to it today; I've never been to one before and this is ~~me~~ the last few weeks at school. If they say about staying on, I might say "yes", because I don't know what they're like and I'd like to get to know the boys. But now I've been to so many [boarding schools], I'm up to here with them. I just want to have a break. I want to get away for the rest of my life. But I don't mean to get away from this school, 'cos this has been the best school I've had in my life! All the rest have been strict. As soon as I hit this school I felt I was just born and come into a new world!

Implicit here is the suggestion that there is, for this boy, a relaxed atmosphere in the school. This is a particularly interesting response which places the boarding school experience within the context of the boy's life as a whole; for him, no matter how good the school he will still want to leave it.

We find reasons for Colin's mixed response when we examine responses made by interviewees to questions about their particular dislikes in relation to the school. These responses begin to portray the boarding school as an institution which is regulated by rules and routines which sometimes fail to respect the individual needs of pupils. Once again, social factors are shown to be of importance to the pupils, in that they express dissatisfaction with the relationships which they share with one another and the staff. Colin describes some of the drawbacks of boarding school; particularly single sex ones:

[...] All the boarding schools I've been in, what I dislike about them is that it's all boys. I don't like, y'know. They've got this funny effect, y'know, when you sleep with them. When

I've been home for the weekend, and I'm used to just lying there and listening to my wireless, and things like this. When I come back here, it just hits me. Y'know like; kids, kids, kids; boys, boys, boys! It drives me crazy. I don't go to someone, like Mr. Talbot, "Oh, I don't like kids in my bedroom" and all this. I just keep it in my mind, so I don't give it out, like. So they can't get a bit ratty and go, "yeah, yeah!" and all this.

Feelings of overcrowding are common, but the complaints do not all revolve around feelings of claustrophobia. Fourteen year old Les, who has been at the school for a year, emphasises the anonymity of the individual who shares a home with 44 other boys, as well as the lack of tranquility. The nature of Les's family circumstances is such that he spends much of the holiday period and many weekends at the school, along with a small number of boys with similar home situations. During the monthly "long weekends" (a period from Friday to Monday inclusive, when the majority of pupils return home) Les is often one of less than twenty left in the school:

I: Do you usually have a good time over the weekend?

Les: Yes, I usually do - on a long weekend especially. Any other weekend's different. It's a bit of a doss place.

I: How do you mean?

Les: Y'know, when you've got the junior wing all to yourself, it's peaceful. You can crash out and sleep all day long. When you've got three rooms full of kids it's chaos. At 6 o'clock in the morning they're up, "d'you want to play games?"

I: D'you find it a bit overcrowded?

Les: Yes, when they all start to pile in one room. A thousand of them in one room...

Later Les describes his feelings of anonymity and his desires to live in a smaller, more intimate unit, where he believes he would receive more individual attention:

Les: [...] I'd rather be in a small family. Say four of five; there's five of us in my family. This is too big for me here. You know, there's forty odd kids here; you're just the odd one out.

I: What do you mean?

Les: Well if someone's doing something else and they don't invite you to help. You think you're left out, y'know. You've got other things to worry about saying "Oh, I'm left out," you know. "Why don't you, y'know, go and take a running jump!" If there's something going on, they don't bother about you. Like if someone's doing some woodwork, they don't ask you if you can help. So as soon as you come and ask me to do something I'll just tell you to go away. Things like that..."

I: Are you saying that it's easy for you to be left out of things because there's so many of you?

Les: Yes. To be honest. Yes [...] like sometimes if you go up to someone they say, "Buzz off, I'm talking!" [...] If I was in a small group y'know and you butted in, you'd say "Yes, what can I do for you?"

A clearer call for more personal attention is difficult to imagine.

Les recognises the constraints which make this sort of situation happen, but he also notes, astutely a possible remedy for the problem, in the qualities he believes to be desirable in staff;

Les: I'd say to anyone who was going to build up a school like this you need people with patience, time; that can understand people, y'know. It's like working as a boss, you get a client come to you [...] you'd have to have time to sit down and listen to him, y'know.

I: How much time do you think the staff here have for you?

Les: I wouldn't say all that much, to be honest. They say "there's a time for the listening and a time for the work."

Les's sophisticated analogy of boss and client suggests a perception of staff-pupil relationships which is not wholly unsympathetic. Within the analogy lies both the recognition of the power differential between staff

and pupil, as well as the view that the staff are there to provide a service to their "clients": the pupils. Les, however, definitely feels that the service can be improved.

Les's plea for more individual consideration is echoed in the complaints concerning the lack of freedom which are made by many boys (9/15). These are dealt with in a later section. Of particular relevance to the present section is the common complaint that places "school" on the list of dislikes (5/15). This is voiced by some pupils who also include the features of schooling in their list of likes. Greg, is one such boy. He states a particular dislike for maths. and English. This attitude to "school" is interesting because it shows a discrimination between the residential life of the school and the formal educational aspects. In the cases where it is seen as both a like and a dislike we are clearly being asked to look at their attitude to schooling in a relative sense, ie. although the school is better than that which they have previously experienced, it is still "boring" and to be avoided if possible. The one rule which sixteen year old Malcolm - on the eve of his departure - finds intolerable is the one which states "you have to go to school", he would rather go fishing!

As has already been suggested, when these boys talk about the environment in which the school is set, they, almost invariably, describe it as something alien. These pupils, who see themselves as city boys, find the tree lined, sheep and cow inhabited fields surrounding the school and the small rural town of 7,000 people "dead", "too small", "too quiet" or "boring". They often refer to it, reductively, as "Toy Town". Les is one

of the few to find something positive to say about the environment: he claims it provides less distractions and enables one to think. Malcolm, after 2½ years at the school, still "can't get used to it" (the quietness), he prefers the sound of traffic and the other noises that he can hear around the clock on the urban council estate of his home. Greg, who comes from a large suburb of Birmingham, and is fifteen years old, still gets lost when he goes into the local town and consequently is "scared" of going out alone there. He recognises the absurdity of on the one hand getting lost in a small town and, on the other, of moving freely around a city of 2 million inhabitants with its hundreds of miles of streets. It emerges, however, that his knowledge of Birmingham's geography is heavily dependant upon the city's bus services; finding one's way around a small town requires different skills.

There is then, among the boys, a certain sense of alienation; of being placed in strange and unfamiliar surroundings. This sense of alienation becomes heightened to one of isolation when they speak of the contact they have with the local population - particularly the local teenagers. Some boys (4/15) tell of being chased through the streets by local youths. Mention is also made of some of the local adult population considering the boys from the school to be "trouble makers". Fourteen year old Chris, who has spent almost two years at the school, makes a highly representative statement on this subject:

Chris: There's been occasion, in the past, when we've been chased [by local youths] and things like that. Sometimes it's unsafe to go out down town. Things are getting better. They used to always stop us from going down town, in case we got beat up or something.

I: Why do you think you don't, or didn't, get on with them ?

Chris: I think it was the kids from the past; The Maxes and Mickies [former pupils with reputations for disruptive and violent behaviour] of this world, thinking they were hard and that. When it comes to the real thing they're off! [...] I think the town's just taking it out on the kids who are left here now [...]

I: If someone in the town asked you what school you went to would you mind saying that you were a pupil here?

Chris: Not really, no. If it was a kid, I think I'd have second thoughts.

I: If you were in a shop or something, or any other situation.

Chris: I'd probably tell them.

I: Definitely?

Chris: No.

I: Why not?

Chris: Dunno.

I: Is it something you feel you would like to keep from some people?

Chris: Yes.

I: Why?

Chris: Ashamed [...] of this school. 'Cos some people think, "Oh, them bastards, they stir up all the trouble. They get into trouble. You've got to watch them!"

I: So you think that some of the people in the town think that the school is filled with trouble makers?

Chris: Yes. In fact that's what everybody in town thinks, probably, except the people that know us. Like, we go into [a local, "up market" cafe/restaurant] with Mr. Talbot and they think the world of us.

Chris does not present a wholly negative view of school-town relations, but the underlying sense that he conveys is that attendance at the school attracts the label of "trouble-maker". The most outstanding feature of

this extract is the impression of isolation which emerges. Not only are these boys often culturally isolated from their environment, by virtue of their urban backgrounds and the fact that they are "foreigners" from, often distant, regions of the country, they are also physically removed from the town, because of the location of the school. Added to this is the perceived hostility of some of the local population.

Whilst the pupils, for the most part, seem to find many aspects of their lives at school satisfying, there is still an overwhelming desire among the boys to return to their homes on a permanent basis. This desire, however, is generally seen by the boys as an unrealistic ideal:

I: [...] if someone came to you tonight and said, "alright, Alan, you can leave now." What would you say?

Alan: I'd say, "how long have I been here? Have I finished my time yet? How long I should've been here?" Well I've got to finish my time, haven't I? I just can't disappear [...] I've got to stick to it. So I've just got to finish it.

This boy seems to be resigned to serving a sentence of unknown duration. Implicit in this notion is the suggestion that his personal satisfaction with the school is an irrelevance, just as is a prisoner's satisfaction with his prison. Sixteen year old Colin sees things in similar terms:

Colin: [...] Mr. Talbot has asked me to stay on, but I've said no. I goes, "I've had eleven years of it and that's enough for me. I've done my school service. I think the maximum's 11 years for schooling. It's about roughly 11 years, but 12 if you're staying on. So I said, "I've done my time like." [...]

The prison metaphor is less pronounced in Colin's response, but the emphasis on time is still present. For both of these boys the purpose of their presence at school is to serve time. Colin's view is interesting, however, in the implied analogy between residential school and something like National Service. This analogy carries with it notions of compulsion, but not punishment, inconvenience but not deprivation. Another important aspect of Colin's response is his clear statement of his right to choose whether or not he "stays on" at the school after the statutory leaving age.

Chris states a desire to leave the school and return to the comprehensive from which he was expelled, though he sees this as "doubtful" and unrealistic desire. He says, candidly, "I doubt if they would have me", owing to his history of bad behaviour in school. Chris's response is echoed many times among the boys. In spite of the school's avowed aim of preparing its pupils for "reintegration" into mainstream schools, all of the boys interviewed expect to be at the school until they reach the statutory leaving age of 16. This may be seen, however, as a realistic response to the fact that all of these boys have less than two years of compulsory schooling remaining.

In spite of the universal desire to leave the school among the boys, few boys consider the reality of leaving without expressing fear and uncertainty. When the topic of how they thought they might feel when the opportunity to leave the school came was raised, the majority of boys said that they had not considered this thought previously (12/15). Many (6/15) indicated that they did not wish to think about it. Chris says he will

"cross that bridge" when he comes to it. Jim, with characteristic directness, admits that the thought "scares" him, like Greg, who describes his fear of leaving the comfort and security of the school for "a little flat with nothing in it".

A possible explanation for the apparent contradiction which exists between these boys' desire to leave the school and their unwillingness to face the reality of this desire, emerges in the following section, in which we consider the comparisons which the boys make between their previous schools and their present school.

3. Comparison Between the Pupils' Present Situation and Other Situations and Institutions.

This is perhaps one of the most revealing sections of the study, since in requiring the boys to make a comparison between their present placement and their previous experience we are asking the boys to consciously place their present situations in the context of their previous experience.

Ten out of the 15 pupils had experience of special schools before coming to this school. Five pupils had prior experience of residential schooling. Brian and Colin, both of whom claim to have been in residential

schools since very early on in their primary school careers, had each been to four residential schools including their present placement. Mick had been to a day special school and two residential schools. Chris and Ian, who both come from the same LEA, had been to the same 'Observation and Assessment Centre' prior to being referred to this school, after having been expelled from their respective comprehensive schools. Alan, Greg and John have lived in childrens' homes - Alan and John for brief periods and Greg for a prolonged period up to the time of the interviews.

In spite of the fairly diverse nature of the pupils' previous institutional experience, there is a striking homogeneity in their views of the relative quality of their present placement compared with previous placements. Without exception (15/15) the pupils consider their present placement to be better than previous institutions, in a variety of ways. Eleven out of the 15 boys refer to preferences in respect of the staff at their present school, because of the greater tolerance of staff members; their increased helpfulness; their greater friendliness and sense of humour; their greater willingness to discuss personal problems and to take a personal interest in pupils; and their tendency to give pupils greater individual attention in their classwork. Greg refers to his particular enjoyment of the physical horseplay in which staff engage with the boys - he is denied this at the children's home, where he spends his weekends and holidays, because of the all female staff at the children's home.

The boys also refer to the smaller number of pupils in class groups, which, they suggest, helps them to make better academic progress because of the lack of distractions and the possibility of more attention

from the teacher. Les places particular emphasis on this aspect of the school, describing the willingness of staff to listen to pupils' academic as well as social problems. This mildly contradicts his previous statements concerning the overcrowded nature of the school and tendency for staff to ignore pupils. This contradiction highlights, perhaps, the fact that whilst his present placement is an improvement on his previous school experience, it is by no means perfect: whilst he receives more attention than previously he still feels that he does not receive enough.

Once again, the material comforts of the school and the school's facilities are described as being of a superior quality, when compared to other schools, but these features are less in prominence than the pupils' belief that the school is more satisfying in an affective sense. With regard to the "homeliness" of the institution, one pupil, Ryan, has already been quoted as declaring the school to be an extremely homely and atmospherically warm place (see above). This is an unusual response, however. Several pupils (5/15) interviewed complained that the residential area is too large to be homely. Also, overcrowding is seen as a negative factor (6/15); having to share bedrooms and bathrooms with large numbers of other boys is also cited as a source of irritation (6/15). Only John, who has been identified earlier as having a particular regard for what the school has to offer in terms of material comfort, declares that the school is "better than my real home". Another factor which detracts from the homeliness of the institution is the relative lack of personal freedom offered to the boys. Lewis makes a representative statement on this subject:

Lewis: There's loads of times when the staff will come in and turn the telly over and watching football, when we don't want them to do it, cos we're watching something else. And it's supposed to be our home, so we should be able to do most things we want, without them stopping us from doing it.

I: Can you tell me something more about the ways in which this place is your home?

Lewis: Well, we've got to live here. So while we live here we should be able to enjoy it here. And we can't enjoy it here, cos sometimes people get on our backs.

I: Is there much effort made here to try and make it your home?

Lewis: I think there's a lot of effort tried. They do the best that they can. But you can't make something that isn't your home, your home.

Lewis's final statement pinpoints the essentially artificial nature of the institution as a home for individuals. It is, however, interesting to note his expectations of the school: he feels that it ought to be the pupils' home in the sense that pupils should be able to "do most things they want". This is perhaps a reflection of his own home experience, which, of course, will not tally, necessarily, with the experience and expectations of others.

When asked if they felt that they missed anything by not attending a conventional comprehensive school, most pupils (11/15) felt they did not; many (10/15) stated a preference for the residential school. (This point will be taken up in the following section). The opportunity to buy MacDonald's hamburgers (1/15), and the absence of girls (3/15) are cited as deficiencies of the residential setting. We have already described (section 1) Colin's particular yearning for female company and his detestation of "boys, boys, boys!" The remaining two boys who mention this

lack, do not see it as a major problem.

4. *Pupils' Relationships With Other People in the School*

A large number of pupils (11/15) refer to the existence of conflict between boys and, specifically, of bullying within the school. Max, who left a month prior to the interviews, is repeatedly referred to as a bully. It is clear, however, that some boys are subjected to more bullying than others. Several boys do not refer to specific bullies so much as "people" in general. Alan describes himself as a victim of repeated bullying:

I: Have you got many friends here? Who is your best friend here, or don't you have one?

Alan: Colin Waters. But I've got a favourite member of staff.

I: Would you say you had a lot of friends here? Not just among the kids?

Alan: Well people normally come up and just start hitting you.

I: Does that happen a lot, Alan? Do you think it happens to you more than it happens to other people?

Alan: I don't know really. It happens to other people. It happens to most people. Yes, I'd think.

Elsewhere, Alan described the nature of the bullying to which he is subjected, and its effect on him, in greater detail:

Alan: ... [unclear] Sometimes I think, "I want to get out of this borstal place." It gets on my nerves and I start swearing [unclear]. It gets on my nerves. [unclear] [...] I just go upstairs and sit down.

I: Does the place make you feel like that?

Alan: No, It's not really. Some people wind you up, and take the Micky out of you and your family; things like that. Just wind you up badly. You just don't know what to do. You just have to stand there and take it. And sometimes They come over and just start punching the hell out of you.

[...]

I: What do you feel you would like to do then?

[...]

Alan: I just go sit in my room and keep quiet. Hope no one'll come in teasing me; punching me - things like that.

"Winding up" is a common source of irritation among the boys, and Brian, Colin, Mick and Alan each link "winding up" with bullying. It is interesting to note here that Alan and Mick complain of being "wound up" when they are in their home surroundings also and do not see it as a problem solely related to school. "Winding up" is often the prelude to physical bullying and usually takes the form of verbal insults which pinpoint personal features of the individuals. These insults range from generalized attacks on individual's families, to more specific and personal remarks, often directed at mothers. These insults invariably refer to the alleged sexual promiscuity of the mothers or accusations of incestuous relationships between the target and his mother; in either case the accusations are made regardless of any known factual basis. Other forms of "winding up" home in on perceived differences among the pupils. These can involve racist remarks, once again, however, regardless of any factual basis. Some boys with dark complexions are referred to as "Pakis", whilst some negro boys are mocked about their racial characteristics. When required, points of difference are hunted out mercilessly and without

concern for consistency. Thus, a characteristic which is picked out from the make up of one individual is ignored with reference to certain other individuals in whom it is present. Colin provides an excellent example of this when he describes the way in which he is mocked and insulted for wearing "cut-offs" (denim jeans which have had the legs shortened to above the knee). He is told by other pupils that "cut-offs" "went out with my mother's teeth" (ie. they are old-fashioned) and he is made an object of derision. This is in spite of the fact other pupils continue to wear "cut-offs" without reproach, and that the particular pair worn by Colin were formerly the property of Max, the much detested bully who has recently left the school. Colin points out that "nobody ever said anything to him" about the fact that cut-offs were unfashionable. Mick complains that his classmates "take the Micky" out of him; they refer to him by the derogatory name of "Horse", because he is considered to have particularly yellow teeth, although it is difficult for the impartial observer to discern any difference between the colour of Mick's teeth and those of many of his accusers. Jim also complains of being bullied by his classmates (he is in a different class to Mick), though gives no specific reasons or incidents, and in personal communication with the researcher since the interviews, he has described the breakdown of friendships at home because of attempts made by his friends to manipulate him into delinquent activity.

What emerges from the discussion of bullying then, is not so much the presence of specific bullies, although the person of Max is nominated repeatedly for the title of school bully, as the existence of a number of particular victims of bullying, who refer to their bullies in generalised terms. This is further supported by the fact that characteristics which

appear to be employed by some pupils to isolate and stigmatize victims of bullying are ignored when present in other boys. The most interesting example of this is seen in the particular way in which the coloured boy Lewis is perceived by the other boys. Whilst some of the other coloured boys in the school are harassed with racialist taunts, Lewis is held in a position of universal high esteem. Repeatedly he is nominated as a figure of trust, and a boy with whom many of the pupils aspire to friendship. He is also repeatedly described as a peace maker, a protector of the bullied and a reliable and trusted advocate of some of the more vulnerable boys.

This brings us to another highly significant point, concerning the structure of the informal organization of the pupil group, and the way in which the pupils regulate their own affairs, with key figures who support the interests of the boys both within the pupil group and as representatives who approach staff. Brian makes a highly representative statement on this topic:

I: Can you tell me something about them [the other boys at the school]?

Brian: Lewis Jones. When you've got something wrong, sometimes I go to him and he talks to you and he tells me to go to Mr. Talbot.

I: How do you mean, when you've got something wrong?

Brian: Well. If someone's hitting you, or winding you up, then you go to Lewis. Lewis'll either sort it out or go to Mr. Talbot.

I: So you feel you can trust Lewis?

Brian: Yes.

Elsewhere, Ryan, who is often referred to, like Lewis, as a key figure among the boys, and who is Lewis's closest friend, refers to Lewis as "the top boss of us" (the boys). He describes the way in which Mr. Talbot places Lewis in a position of special responsibility for control of other boys and relies upon his services heavily. Ryan comments on this situation and gives us a glimpse of what is a clearly defined but semi-formal hierarchy, apparently recognised by staff as well as pupils.

Ryan: He [Mr. Talbot] trusts Lewis. I don't know what he's going to do when Lewis ain't here, to tell the truth.

I: In what way?

Ryan: Well, I mean, Lewis, right, he's the top boss, I'n he, with us. If Mr. Talbot tells him to do something right, then Lewis has got to do it. When Lewis ain't here, he's going to get me. He's going to have to tell me to do things, right. 'Cos I suppose I'll be next in line. I ain't gonna do it.

I: Why not?

Ryan: Lewis does a brilliant job as boss, right? I mean, he keeps us all quiet - he never gets us in trouble [...] The problem is, he keeps us too quiet. We don't have a laugh. Y'know, everything has to be quiet. I know that when I get to Lewis's position in jobs, I'm gonna want to have a laugh. I ain't gonna be just so, to Mr. Talbot, y'know. So probably I'll start losing responsibilities, but I don't really give a shit, [Pause] 'cos it ain't fair on the other kids, who work for their jobs, yeah. They do the games room, they do the common rooms and turn all the lights off everywhere, yeah. All they get's a cup of tea and a fag and that's it. Without having a bit of a laugh, y'know.

Ryan's position as second in line behind Lewis in the pupil hierarchy is verified by comments made by other boys. It is interesting to note, however, that Ryan recognises that his informal status is only given official sanction if he conducts himself in a manner acceptable to the official hierarchy, (ie Mr. Talbot).

In an official sense there is a hierarchy among the boys which is a component of the organizational structure of the school. It centres around the fact that the boys are divided into juniors (sometimes referred to as "intermediates") and seniors. The sleeping arrangements in the "house" are divided into a junior and senior wing, with the flat for certain seniors. The physically elevated position of the flat, above and separate from the main pupil bedrooms, and the smaller, more personalised bedrooms, private sanitary arrangements, and the fact that it is occupied by Lewis and Ryan (who have a room together) and two other senior boys, give sleeping in the flat a high value among the boys. There are two pupil common rooms, one senior and one junior. Class groupings are also, generally, segregated on a junior-senior basis. There are also official clearly defined privileges associated with senior status, such as later bed times, exemption from compulsory activities on certain occasions, and a higher level of pocket money. The qualitative distinction between juniors and seniors is generally associated with the differences in privileges, though there are clear unofficial distinctions which make the status differential quite clear, as Alan points out:

I: You're a senior now aren't you? How do you feel about that?

Alan: I didn't like being a junior because you got bossed around by the seniors. But now I'm a senior you don't.

I: Do you boss juniors about?

Alan: You got no choice [laughs]. We got to do jobs by Mr. Talbot and Mr. Talbot tells you to tell the juniors to do it.

When it is remembered that Alan is a self confessed victim of bullying, and clearly the occupant of a low status position among the senior group, this statement may appear to be contradictory. There is perhaps, however, a distinction to be made between being bullied and being "bossed around", the latter has not necessarily connotations of coercion, as is inferred by the fact that Ryan describes Lewis as capable of "keeping us all quiet" without his being dubbed a bully. Furthermore, the dual role occupied by Lewis of "Top Boss" and pupil-counsellor/protector seems to carry built in safeguards against pupils being bullied into compliance with official school demands. This makes Lewis's role vital in the school's organizational structure, both formal and informal, for he manages to serve the needs of the both, though not always, as we shall see below, without a conflict of interests.

An additional feature of the informal status hierarchy among the pupils, from the pupils' point of view, is the distinction which they draw between "the Cabbages", "the Joes" and the rest. "Cabbage" is a term used to refer to pupils who combine conspicuously low level of academic performance and intellectual ability, with relatively poor social integration. Some such pupils, in spite of their age, fail to attain official senior status, or achieve it later than others. Thus suggesting a certain official basis to the "Cabbage" label. Those considered by the pupils to be "Cabbages" tend to be regarded as notably immature and socially inadequate by the staff. Lewis and Ryan, on the other hand, combine social sophistication with charm and high regard for personal appearance. As has already been stated, they are repeatedly cited as particular friends of many boys, although Lewis and Ryan do not provide

reciprocal nominations of their admirers. They clearly combine authority with popularity.

Lewis and Ryan are also the two "Top Joes" at Fairfield. "Joe" is a term used by the boys to describe those boys who have particular "job" responsibilities at Fairfield. The act of doing jobs is often referred to as "Joeing". There is a certain ambiguity attached to this term, in that "Joeing" is seen as both demeaning and desirable for the privileges it carries. It is also seen as a sign of favour and trust of the principal, to the extent that "Joeing" itself is seen as a privilege (see chapter 6). Ryan's complaints about the inadequacy of the rewards for "Joeing" are unique in the data. The named "Joes" appear to be the higher status pupils. Certainly, "Cabbage" status is incompatible with "Joe" status. It would seem from the data, however, that the personal qualities of Ryan and Lewis are particularly significant, when we consider their positions in the informal hierarchy. Simply being "Top Joe" (which might represent high official status) is not enough, but the combination of popularity and official high status would seem to be a potent combination, from the pupil perspective.

The combination of popularity and authority is by no means obligatory. It is important to note that coercive power has existed at Fairfield prior to the more *charismatic* (in a Weberian sense) regime of Lewis and Ryan. Ryan displays his own sensitivity and sense of justice and provides some interesting recollections of his life as a junior at the school:

I: What do you think of the kids here?

Ryan: I feel sorry for a lot of them, but I don't show it. I mean the kid who I probably feel most sorry for is John Wilson.

I: Why's that?

Ryan: He's got nothing, has he? He ain't got nothing. I mean he thinks he's white! [He is a coloured boy of mixed parentage]

I: Does he?

Ryan: He really does believe he's white, yeah! And [...] he got his hair cut, right [at the school, by a member of staff; not a qualified hairdresser] here. It really got fucked up, you know. Boded up! And he knows that, but what can he do about it? How else can he - he ain't got no money. He can't go down town and get it cut himself. He can't go to no one else. He can't go home and say, "mum, get us an 'air cut." 'Cos he ain't got no home to go to, has he? I mean, here is his home. Whatever they do to him here, he can't do nothing about. They could beat the shit out of him, but he couldn't do nothing. If he went to the social service about it, they'd pass it over because he's a bit up here [indicating "mental"] ain't he?

I: Basically he's very vulnerable then.

Ryan: Yes. He ain't got no one to turn to.

[...]

I: Is there any way that you could help him.

Ryan: Yes, I do sometimes. I buy him cars and things, little cars. But I found out the next day - I bought him a car right? One of those Dinky things - I found out the next day the junior's had nicked it off him.

I: So you're a bit like a big brother then?

Ryan: I dunno. [Pause] Some of them. I'd like to be, y'know. I'd hate to be hated by them. For them to think I'm a bully, something like that. [Pause] 'Cos I know what being bullied is. 'Cos when Max and that lot was here, I got it everyday. Me, Williams and Philip. We got chucked about like a piece of shit. And I can imagine now, how it would be for the little ones. I mean. The juniors are now like what we was to Max and that lot: little shits that mean nothing. Which is what I don't wanna treat the juniors as.

I: You feel you've got some responsibility to behave in a

certain way to them.

Ryan: Yes. I mean. Some of the little sods I really hate, right? But I know if I saw them getting beaten up down town, I'd jump in. No doubt. Even though all the bad things they done.

I: Is that because you're all in this school together?

Ryan: I suppose so. But some of them are so defenseless aren't they?

I: When you were a junior were there any seniors like you are now?

Ryan: Yes, there was Joe Smith. He was alright. I could talk to him. He was the only one really.

Ryan reveals a strong sense of responsibility here, and a very caring attitude towards the other boys, which seems to tally with what the other seniors say about him. In spite of his denial of the fact, Ryan does seem to show that he "feels sorry" for some of the juniors, through his behaviour towards them and the presents he buys for John Wilson. In this way Ryan reveals a certain defensiveness in acknowledging his feelings of sympathy for some junior boys. It is perhaps owing to this defensiveness that he feels the need to declare his "hatred" for "some of the little sods". This professed hatred, however, is severely undermined by his willingness to defend these "defenseless" youngsters, and his admission of brotherly feelings towards them. His own experience of bullying, furthermore, is employed as a source of insight into the plight of the junior children, in whose service he seems prepared to channel his feelings of aggression. The clear sense of responsibility expressed by Ryan for the vulnerable younger children, also sheds further light on the "cabbage" label. John Wilson is an archetypal "cabbage", and Ryan on occasions refers to him as such. It is clear, however, that "cabbage" status is not

necessarily interchangeable with "victim" status, as one might expect, because the vulnerability implied by the "cabbage" label arouses feelings of sympathy in one of the central figures in the pupil hierarchy. Another important feature of Ryan's extract, concerned with this topic, is his insistence that these "brotherly" feelings are less attributable to a sense of group solidarity, as the interviewer suggests, than straightforward feelings of sympathy which derive from Ryan's observations and his own experience of victimization.

When we come to look at what Lewis has to say more closely, we find a similarly deep sense of responsibility and evidence of very carefully considered thought, particularly on the topic of bullies, and the personality of Max in particular:

Lewis: Max was known as a bully by the teachers, which in a way was wrong. I know a lot of teachers here don't think much of him. But I think if they cared for him - I mean really cared for him here - that he wouldn't be like he is now. 'Cos I think when you're taking a kid away from a broken home, it does him worse [...] 'cos I mean, if he was at home [...] How I can explain it is, why he is like he is, is 'cos no one's cared for him. And I think that what makes some kids here so bad, like Fred [a former pupil renowned for bullying and disruption] 'cos no one really did care for Fred here. And Winston [a former pupil renowned for disruption and uncontrollable behaviour; one of Fred's contemporaries]. No one cared for him. No one really sat down and talked to him about what he was doing. He just used to get told off and then sent to bed, or something like that. I think that's what just made him more angrier, nastier. But then you get teachers like Mr. Badger [the Headteacher]. Now, he will pull you aside, by yourself and he will ask you why you did it and do you think it's right. And he'll ask you the truth.

There is a surprising depth of insight in Lewis's remarks quoted above, which show that he has thought carefully and deeply about some of the people and situations he has known. This is perhaps one of the reasons why he is so admired by many of the boys, and valued by the school principal. He shows a capacity for empathy which might be the envy of some of the teachers, as does Ryan as we saw earlier. A pupil such as Lewis is clearly a highly valuable resource in the residential community; not least because he devotes his insight and popularity to the service of the official aims of the school. What is interesting, however, about both Lewis's and Ryan's remarks, is their apparent lack of awareness that their sympathetic and humanitarian views serve important needs in the school, and in many ways support the formal organization. Both are critical of the school, Ryan for its treatment of "defenseless" juniors, and Lewis for what he perceives to be a lack of understanding by some staff of the more difficult pupils. Their attitudes and behaviour which derive from their perceptions of faults in the school system, in fact serve the interests of the whole school community beyond the perceived faults. It is only through the attempt to overcome the imperfections of the system that these boys discover, and are discovered to have, a role in taking some responsibility for the affective needs of their fellow pupils.

Another interesting point to be considered, in the extract spoken by Lewis reported above, is his reference to Fred as the former incumbent of Lewis's position as "Top Boss" (Ryan's description) among the boys. It is possible that Lewis identifies with Fred's situation as an isolated focus of particular attention, owing to his own position within the pupil hierarchy. It is clear that Lewis takes his own position and the

accompanying responsibilities very seriously, and this observation is supported by the comments of Ryan, quoted earlier. Ryan shares this sense of responsibility, and both pupils, by their own testimony and that of other boys, have very caring attitudes towards their fellow pupils. In this way they affect, powerfully, the atmosphere of the school, for the whole school community. They seem to operate a distinct regime which differs considerably from that which existed under the influence of Fred and his peers. The extent of the power exerted by Ryan and Lewis is described obliquely by Ryan when he suggests that after Fred and his disruptive friends left, Mr. Talbot was able to behave in a less dictatorial and headmasterly way (see section 1 above, for a fuller account of this).

The power held by Lewis can have its negative consequences. Lewis describes a situation which highlights the personal problems which his position can create for himself and the way in which his power over the pupils can lead to conflicts of loyalty: as if he is being used as a tool by the official hierarchy. This shows in the following account given by Lewis:

Lewis: Well, sometimes he [Mr. Talbot] says things that we have to agree with. Like the incident with Jim [...] When Chris came down for a fag [...] Chris came down for a fag. I was talking to Mr. Talbot on the phone, from downstairs to upstairs, and he told me not to give Chris one, and not say that it was him that told me. For me to say it on my own. But I had to say it to him of course. And I felt really guilty about it. So I said, "just take a few puffs of this and go up". So the next minute, when we got upstairs, Jim goes to Mr. Talbot, "can I go and watch the video in the flat?" So Jim's sent up to the flat. Not telling me to say nothing to him. Chris goes over to the sleeping-in room [where Mr. Talbot is] and Mr. Talbot says, "there's one thing I don't like about Lewis,

is that he won't give you a fag but he'll let Jim watch the video." So he's turning them against me.

I: Why does he do that?

Lewis: I don't know. I honestly don't know. But then, if it weren't for Chris I wouldn't have known about this. I told him about Jim coming up last night, and he said, "Do you know what was said about you last night?" And I told him the truth. And I was talking to a key worker and he said, next time it happens just say "no" to him [Mr. Talbot]. So that got me pinned down a bit. So that's one bad point, that he was turning them against me. When he shouldn't do that. 'Cos if they did come nasty to me, then there's nothing I can do except for hit them. But then luckily Chris told me about it [...] It's the first time it's happened to me. But it really shocked me and I swore I would get him back for it. 'Cos I would never do that to anybody.

I: Has that changed the way you feel about Mr. Talbot.?

Lewis: Yes, it's changed it a lot. I can't trust him as much as I used to be able to.

It is important to note that Lewis's story is verified by three other interviewees, Chris and Jim, who were both closely involved, as well as Ryan. What is revealed here is Lewis's tremendous loyalty to the school, as well as the loyalty of some of the boys to Lewis. This loyalty, however, forces him into a dilemma, when it conflicts with peer group relationships. Lewis sticks to what he sees as his official responsibilities, and his loyalty is maintained, even when he feels that Mr. Talbot has tried to turn the boys against him. In one sense this incident reveals one of the ways in which the principal attempts to exert control over the pupil hierarchy, but on the other hand it also shows how this is dependent upon the cooperation of boys such as Lewis. This whole incident, in fact, could be interpreted as evidence of a deliberate attempt by the principal to assert his own authority over that of Lewis and to undermine him and his power over the boys. Interestingly, however, Lewis

is not undermined because of the good quality of the channels of communication which exist between the boys, as well as the degree of trust and respect which the boys have for Lewis. Furthermore, Lewis's admission that if the pupils were against him he would be forced to use physical coercion would suggest that he could be the "top boss" in the Fred mould, but that he prefers his own style of benevolent leadership by just and not coercive means.

Whilst Lewis is somewhat bemused by this apparent conflict with Mr. Talbot, Ryan seems to subscribe to a view of the relationship between Mr. Talbot and the senior boys which suggests a conflict of interests which is resolved by the principal's exertion of his greater power. One of Ryan's choices of example to support this view is identical to the one reported by Lewis:

Ryan: I know I'm being used by Talbot [...] He's using us by putting all this responsibility shit on us. You know [...] responsibilities come with privileges, they reckon, right? You tell me what me and Lew get that no other senior boys don't get [...] He thinks that when he gives us a privilege that we're thinking, "Oh, great!" But he don't know that we're thinking, "bastard!" When he puts us on night jobs and he gives us sweets. The next thing we know we have to go and give the other kids a bollocking for making a noise. We don't like doing that, 'cos it makes us feel like the kids are going to think, "Oh, Ryan thinks he's a member of staff now." I'll tell you an incident, right. Lew was on jobs and Chris came down and asked for a fag, right. Lew had been told by Mr. Talbot that Chris isn't allowed to have a fag. So anyway Chris goes back upstairs and says, "Lew won't let me have a fag." Mr. Talbot goes, "that's not fair. Lewis should have given you a cigarette." Then he went on, saying, "Lewis's being completely unfair to you Chris, because he's let Jim go up into the flat and watch the video, but he can't even let you have a fag." Now Mr. Talbot sent Jim up to the flat without Lew knowing and he told Lew, Chris was not to have a fag. I think that's bad [...] Immediately Chris is going to think, "Oh, Lew's a bastard!"

There is an interesting difference here between Lewis's and Ryan's accounts. In Ryan's account Chris goes to Mr. Talbot to complain of Lewis's unfairness, whilst in Lewis's account, which is partly based on what he claims to have been told by Chris, it is Mr. Talbot who raises the question of Lewis's unfairness with Chris. This subtle difference indicates both the care with which Chris approaches Lewis, as well as the extent to which the principal's supposed machinations can be seen to threaten Lewis's position. Ryan, like Lewis, has no doubt that the principal created this situation for just that purpose. Ryan describes how simple, apparently humdrum, daily events can carry significances with regard to this subtle powerplay:

I: So has Mr. Talbot set Lew up for that then?

Ryan: Yes.

I: Why?

Ryan: I dunno me and Lew was trying to work that out, we couldn't work it out really [...] He's as nice as anything to Lew, when he's there, but when Lew's not there! I remember one incident. If Lew had been here at this time when Mr. Talbot was clearing out the laundry, and there was trainers in there, right? Lew's trainers were in there, mine were in there. I was there; he didn't touch my trainers. He left my trainers there. He was going, "move those trainers out". Chris goes, "there Lew's, sir." He goes, "I don't care! Get them down the boot room." He didn't touch mine, 'cos I was there. But because Lew wasn't there he just moved them!

I: So is he trying to play you off against each other?

Ryan: I think so, yeah.

I: So doing those jobs and things isn't much of a privilege by the sound of it.

Ryan: No.

I: Do you feel you could say, "no, I don't want to do it?"

Ryan: Yes, you could, but then you'd have him on your back for God knows how long.

I: What would that be like?

Ryan: Well he can be a real cunt. He can give you everything to do; the bad jobs. He can get you doing the juniors' showers. He'll accidentally make you late for dinner. He'll send you down town at about 10 minutes before the shops close and tell you to get something.

I: Is that the sort of thing he has done?

Ryan: He can do it. I mean, [...] he can give you raps for wearing shoes in the house. You've seen the way he's got at Timothy...

Ryan sees himself as the victim of exploitation. Like Lewis, he is conscious of a conflict of interests when he is asked by Mr. Talbot to discipline other boys. Like Lewis, he perceives a fine line between showing a sense of responsibility for some of the pupils, and acting as if he "thinks he is a member of staff". Neither boy wishes to cross this line. However, whilst Lewis displays an underlying sense of respect for Mr. Talbot and supports the official regime because he sees it as a just cause, Ryan gives the impression that he co-operates because he fears the consequence of non co-operation and because it suits his personal interests. At one point Lewis criticises Ryan for his lack of respect for rules and his habit of "taking liberties" and not asking staff permission for certain activities, such as making cups of coffee. Lewis sees this as being "unfair". Lewis seems to be serving the needs of the school because he believes in it, Ryan's involvement is, essentially, self-serving. Ryan recognises this in his doubt about adopting Lewis's mantle of "top boss" because of his unwillingness to approach tasks without "having a laugh" with the other boys. Whilst both are unafraid to voice criticism of the school, Ryan's attitude is generally negative. He is suspicious of Mr.

Talbot's motives, but feels forced to comply with his wishes in order to avoid the sanctions which could be enforced against him if he failed to co-operate.

Both boys, however, see themselves as serving an important function in the school community. Because of their high status in the pupil hierarchy, they form a useful buffer between Mr. Talbot and the other boys. They do not like to see themselves as an extra arm of staff control, and yet they admit to performing certain management functions among the pupil population. Ryan in particular, however, sees their personal power as being limited by the official hierarchy (ie. chiefly in the form of the school principal) which will strip them of official responsibilities if they fail to discharge their duties in an appropriate manner. It is possible, however, that the boys may underestimate the power they possess, as is seen by the way in which they foil the principal's apparent attempt to make some pupils antagonistic towards Lewis, described earlier, owing to the closeness and openness of relationships among some of the boys.

As the reader will have observed already, Mr. Talbot, emerges from these conversations with the boys as a person of great significance. He is the single most mentioned person throughout all of the Farfield interviews. The interviewees often mention Mr. Talbot before the interviewer has mentioned him, in relation to topics which one would not readily associate with the school principal. As has already been shown Mr. Talbot often forms an integral part of pupils' recollected first impressions of the school. He is also synonymous with the notions of authority held by pupils. The pupils believe that Mr. Talbot runs the

school, makes all the rules, controls the degree of freedom of restrictions within the school and makes all policy decisions. It's also a common belief among the pupils that Mr. Talbot owns the school; he is, in fact, a co-owner. What is seen by the pupils as the high quality of material provision within the school is attributed by the pupils to Mr. Talbot's personal generosity, and their belief is encouraged, according to Ryan, by Mr. Talbot himself (see above). As far as thinking about the school is concerned, for virtually all of the boys, Mr. Talbot is the central focus of interest. It is not surprising, therefore, that in answer to the question, "Who is the most important person in the school?" that Mr. Talbot's name was not mentioned by only two interviewees; who mentioned a personal friend and a key worker. Gary sums up a view of Mr. Talbot's role and position in the school, which is supported by the statements of many other pupils:

I: Who do you think the most important person in the school is?

Gary: Mr. Talbot

I: Why's that?

Gary: He's in charge. And he tell's you, like, what to do, and all this stuff. Like, Mr. Talbot told me once. Mr. Badger [the headteacher] told me to do something. Mr. Talbot wanted to see me and Mr. Talbot called me over. He wanted to see me first. It would be Mr. Talbot first because he's more in charge.

There is a faint echo here, in the way in which the principal is seen to take precedence over the headteacher, of the way in which the principal is perceived to assert himself over Lewis, as a more powerful figure. Mr. Talbot represents the absolute power throughout the school. The pupils see

him as the source of all privileges and rewards. Les describes Mr. Talbot as "the main man". When Mr. Talbot is discussed, however, words used tend to emphasise the instrumental as opposed to expressive functions of his role; he is not viewed with the warmth and trust that is shown by boys for some staff.

It has been mentioned already, in earlier sections of this thesis, that there is a strong preoccupation, among the boys, with the material aspects of provision in the school. This preoccupation is reflected in many of the boys' perceptions of the "group meetings" which are held from time to time in the school. These meetings are referred to by the interviewees (7/15) as consisting of sessions in which all the pupils are brought together by the principal in one of the two boys' common rooms. No other staff are present at the meetings. Usually, according to the boys, the content of the meeting is Mr. Talbot giving an account of recent purchases for or modifications to the school buildings, and an account of how much money "he has spent" on the school and the boys. There is also, usually, mention of new rules or the reinforcement of established rules. Unanimously the pupils state that no pupil ever responds to Mr. Talbot's offer of the opportunity to speak publicly on any issue which concerns them. Reasons given for not participating are usually embarrassment or, more commonly that they would not be listened to anyway. The School principal then, is very much seen, by the boys, as the ultimate authority in the school and, on the basis of their own testimony, they relate to him in this rather impersonal way.

Many pupils speak of the power the principal has to have them sent to less pleasant establishments, such as Detention Centres. Lewis, at one point, refers to the fact that Mr. Talbot sometimes tells the boys that some former pupils have ended up in Detention Centres, when Lewis claims this is not the case. Lewis sees this as a mere control strategy which, whilst having the desired effect upon pupils, is all the same, illegitimate. The principal dominates the pupils' perceptions of the general organization of the school and he is universally viewed with a combination of fear and respect. Pupils believe that if they do the principal's bidding they will earn a relatively pleasant and materially rewarding experience, failure to do this can result in severely negative consequences.

The principal is seen by the pupils as being removed from the rest of the staff. Whilst relationships between pupils and the principal are seen, by the pupils, as essentially authority based, relationships with other staff are often defined in different terms. Without exception, all of the interviewees said that there were people on the staff with whom they could discuss personal matters and receive a sympathetic hearing. Mr. Talbot is mentioned by 4 pupils as a person they would consider going to with personal problems. The pupils' key workers, however, are the most nominated staff members in this context. Pupils who mention specific instances in which they have approached staff members with problems invariably refer going to key workers (7/15) and sometimes to teachers (4/15). It is commonly acknowledged by the boys (14/15) that the majority of staff are prepared to give pupils time to talk about personal things, many pupils cite this as an important point of contrast to their previous

schools or other institutions. Whilst all pupils identify staff members, specifically or generally, as being available for discussion of a personal nature, not all the pupils make use of this facility. Malcolm and Ian state that they "never" go to staff with personal problems. Malcolm keeps such things to himself and confides only in his father, whilst Ian talks only to his grandfather. Both pupils, however, acknowledge the opportunity provided by staff at school to discuss problems. For some pupils also, there is a limit to the nature of the personal matters which they would discuss with staff. Ryan says that he would not discuss incidents in which he had broken the law or sexual matters with staff. Ryan does, however, recount an incident in which he returned to school with large quantities of stolen clothing. Ryan's key worker suspected that neither Ryan nor his mother could have afforded to have bought the clothes. Ryan admits to having fabricated a number of explanations but was eventually persuaded to admit that he had received stolen goods, because, as he put it, he felt his key worker to be "a good bloke", who he would not wish to deceive. Ryan speaks highly of the way in which the key worker handled the issue, by talking over the problem with Ryan. The key worker took the incident no further but Ryan claims that he would not commit a similar act as long as he is at the school, owing to the discussion with the key worker. Many other pupils refer to close trusting relationships with key workers, towards whom they feel a sense of loyalty and affection, though, Lewis points out, some key workers are lazy and do not provide as good a service as others.

Overall these pupils describe both their fellow pupils and staff in the school as easy to get along with sympathetic, supportive,

approachable and easy to communicate with. There are tensions, clearly, and there are certain staff and pupils who are singled out repeatedly for criticism. Max is referred to as a bully, though not by everyone, and Mick is regarded by a number of boys as a trouble maker who leads other boys to mischief. Both John and Ian say this of him, in spite of the fact that Mick names John as his "best mate". Similarly, one member of the teaching staff is singled out for criticism, by Ryan, Les and Lewis, in particular, as an unsympathetic individual who is overbearing and lacking in a sense of humour:

Ryan: Mr Smith [...] he ain't no special school teacher [...] he might as well be in an ordinary school.

One RSW is also described by 2 pupils as being irritating owing to his habit of poking fun at certain pupils. These latter points add emphasis to the general opinion that pupils value staff who give them time, understanding and are generally sympathetic.

5. Freedom, Restrictions and Rules

The question of freedom is rarely raised by pupils. When asked if they felt they had sufficient freedom at school the vast majority felt that they had quite a lot of freedom with few restrictions being placed upon them (11/15). Some boys (4/15) feel, however, that they ought to be allowed into the local town during the weekday evenings; this is not

permitted by the school. It is unanimously remarked by the pupils with experience of other residential institutions that they have more freedom in their present school than at their previous schools. Whilst there are few complaints about the level of freedom, this is not to say, however, that they feel totally free; on the contrary, the boys are well aware of particular restrictions, but they seem to accept them, without complaint.

Some boys, notably, from among those with a great deal of residential experience, seem to have an institutionalised view of freedom. Brian claims that he "feels fine" at the school and declares that there is much greater freedom at this school than previous placements. However, the only difference he cites, in this context, is the fact that he is permitted to go home every weekend at his present school, as opposed to the less frequent intervals permitted by his previous schools.

Those who are critical of levels of freedom, however, tend to compare the school regime with what they consider to be "normal" home life (ie. their own homes). They state that there are more restrictions at the school than at home, relating to such things as bed times and the availability of cigarettes. For the majority of boys such restrictions seem to be acceptable. When it comes to comparing levels of freedom at Farfield with former schools all pupils declare the present "school" (ie. as opposed to the "house") as permitting greater freedom. Ryan, once again, provides a frank and interesting perspective of this particular area of concern and, characteristically, points to areas where he feels there to be injustice, whilst admitting to his own willingness to make good use of the official system for his own ends:

I: How does this school compare with your last school?
[a state comprehensive].

Ryan: The school here is better, but I don't think the home life
is as good, because you ain't got as much freedom.

[...]

I: What sort of things, about this school, are better?

Ryan: Well. It's more relaxed, i'n'it? I mean at normal schools
the bell goes and everyone's gotta shoot off to the next
lesson. But here, you can take a bit more time, have
an extra hour or finish off something you want to
finish.

[...]

I: When you talk about this school, what do you think of?

Ryan: I'd think of the house, I think.

I: Can you give me some detail about being here and at your
old school?

Ryan: Well, here you can smoke. You do a lot more things here,
in the school, and get away with them.

I: Like what?

Ryan: Swear. Get out of lessons. I mean you can go out of
lessons with good excuses like, can't you! With crap
excuses like, "oh, sir, can I go down town?" and, "sir,
the laundry's messy, I'd better give Janet a hand or
something like that. And you can get off school just like
that, and you couldn't do that in a normal school, could
you?"

I: Is that a good thing?

Ryan: Yeah. [...] Because the majority of time you're in school
everyday, but I reckon it's good to have a break from
lessons.

I: So in a way there's more freedom here?

Ryan: Yes in the school, but in the home, no. If you're at home
I mean you can go outside and see your mates, can't you?
But here, you have to get permission to go down town; you
get the mini-bus going past, with the little ones; you get
Mr. Talbot doing his shopping about town. Y'know. You
can't really walk around town on a Saturday without getting
seen, can you?

I: D'you think that's deliberate?

Ryan: I'm not sure. I think Mr. Talbot sometimes goes into town on Saturdays to keep an eye on us. When he's walking round. But not the mini-buses [...] But you still get seen, don't you? I mean everything you do here, near enough, you have to get permission for, and at home, you don't, do you? I mean here, you have to ask for a cup of coffee. At home you can just go and make one. You get "suppertime". You have to wait for your meals, don't you? You have to wait for breakfast, wait for lunch, wait for supper. At home you can just get it, can't you?

Ryan's analysis of the degree of freedom at the school reveals subtle shades of analysis of his own experience. His description of the relaxed atmosphere of the school and the institutionalized nature of the living accommodation and the house regime reveal different levels of freedom. Although Ryan seems to find some of the restrictions imposed by the institutional organization somewhat irksome, this does not represent, wholly, his view of the school. As has already been shown his general impressions of the school are highly positive and he finds the place "homely". Ryan's statement here, however, highlights a commonly held view among the boys that whilst he feels that the school does not restrict his personal freedom to an excessive degree that he still feels there to be inroads made into his personal freedom. These inroads are clearly a source of irritation but seem to be, largely, accepted as part and parcel of his residential experience; considering the fact that the school is a residential institution and not a private family home.

The degree to which the pupils see their environment as being rule governed, varies considerably among the boys interviewed. Colin, representing one extreme of opinion, declares there to be "no rules" at the school, whilst Mick, at the opposite end of the spectrum sees "loads of

rules". The majority (10/15) of boys interviewed state that there are "not many" rules and certainly not too many. Those boys who have substantial experience of other residential institutions find less rules at this school than at previous placements, and Greg, who spends holidays and weekends at a children's home describes the house rules as the same as he would expect to find in a "normal house". This view contrasts markedly with that represented by several pupils who return to their families at weekends and in the holidays. They reveal that there are many more rules than they would expect to find in a normal family home. Alex points to an excess of petty rules, complaining that there are too many rules relating to the pupils' activities during their "free time". He refers to the compulsory activities which all the boys have to engage in between Monday and Thursday, during the evenings; he also complains about the lack of freedom to go to the town when he chooses. For the vast majority of pupils, however, a notable feature of the rules at the school is the fact that there are few "strict" rules. When asked to recall rules pupils tend to cite negative rules, such as "keep off the car park", the prohibition against salt at meal times, the prohibition against smoking except in the appointed place at the appointed time.

Whilst all boys tend to be aware of rules, there is a common feeling that rules in this school are flexible, and can be "bent" in certain circumstances. Such circumstances usually relate to the personal feelings of staff members, particularly Mr. Talbot. Mr. Talbot is generally credited with making the rules in the school. The pupils interviewed unanimously declared that they had no involvement in rule making, and the majority found the idea of their involvement, novel and

quite unimaginable. Ian cited instances where he had made suggestions to members of staff who had promised to bring them up at the staff meetings, though he was doubtful that any changes in rules had resulted from them. The pupils are very doubtful that Mr. Talbot would consider their wishes and feelings with regard to rule making. As has been suggested already, by Ryan and others, Mr. Talbot is seen, by all, as very much the absolute boss of the establishment. Consultation is not a part of Mr. Talbot's management strategy, according to the pupils and is quite incompatible with his customary style, as described by the boys.

The rules which receive most comment among the pupils are those relating to smoking. The school provides cigarettes and distributes them at particular times throughout the day; the school deducts the cost of the cigarettes from the pupils' pocket money. The pupils are generally limited to 5 cigarettes a day. Many pupils (8/15) feel this to be insufficient but, at the same time, admit to being unable to afford a large number of cigarettes. Thus, there is a general acknowledgement of the common sense basis of this rule. Similarly, it is irksome to some pupils that they should be restricted to smoking only in the "boot room" (a windowless, porch like structure where outdoor shoes are kept) which is a dark, cold and generally uncomfortable place. Again, however, they recognise the need to adhere to fire regulations. One rule which is cited (8/15) as being unreasonable, however, with no redeeming features, is that which is referred to under the title of "collective responsibility". From the pupils' point of view this rule simply amounts to the fact that when one of the pupils damages an item of school property, all the pupils are fined in order to replace it. This rule is generally considered to be unfair and

pupils tend to see the rule as an excuse for fund raising at their expense. Similarly, abuses of smoking privileges, misbehaviour in town and other misdemeanours of a like nature, are reported to sometimes result in blanket restrictions, whereby all boys maybe banned from going into town unaccompanied, or stopped from smoking.

When commenting on the consequences for pupils of infringing the official rules of the school the name of Mr. Talbot is often evoked by pupils. Rule breaking is discouraged through the use of punishments, tellings off, being sent to bed early, not being permitted to return home at weekends and corporal punishment, which, according to the pupils, are fair and never excessive. The threat of having "weekends stopped" is cited repeatedly (9/15) as a deterrent to misconduct. Lewis speaks frankly about punishment in the school and comments that it is usually administered fairly and appropriately; he particularly comments that the rare uses of corporal punishment are, as far as he is concerned, necessary and appropriate. Lewis cites two incidents to illustrate a fair and unfair use of physical punishment. The first concerns Max, who was struck by the school principal as a punishment for "beating up badly" Ryan. This is seen by Lewis as a fair and reasonable punishment, which Lewis believes, helped deter Max from bullying other boys. The second incident involved Ryan also. This time Ryan was pulled off his chair onto the floor by a member of staff as a punishment for verbal rudeness. Lewis describes this second example as unfair and excessive, because in his opinion a verbal offence should not be dealt with by such physical means.

It is interesting to note, that whilst many of the pupils are aware of the fact that the use of corporal punishment in schools is illegal, they also feel that it is a legitimate form of punishment that is appropriate in certain circumstances, when not used excessively. Perhaps more importantly, it is administered on the spot, and there is a certain finality and clarity associated with physical punishment which is, perhaps, appealing to these boys (some of whom employ similar methods when they feel the need). Lewis subscribes to this view. Both he and Ryan, however, complain about the reputed habit of the principal of telling apocryphal stories to the boys about past pupils. These stories referred to by several boys (5/15), often describe former pupils with reputations for disruptive behaviour as having been admitted to Detention Centres and other institutions for juvenile offenders. Lewis, objects strongly to these stories because he believes many of them to be untrue, owing to personal knowledge he has of certain former pupils. Whilst, Lewis believes that Mr. Talbot used these stories for the purposes of a deterrent for the younger boys, and an incentive for good behaviour, he feels that the use of deception is an illegitimate tool. Ryan, agrees with this line of argument, describing many such stories told by Mr. Talbot, with characteristic directness, as "bullshit".

In their discussion of the rules and limitations upon freedom imposed by the school, these pupils show a willingness to voice penetrating criticisms often coupled with a mature and unselfish acceptance of these rules and restrictions as necessities in the circumstances in which they live. It is important to emphasise that this acceptance does not appear to be grudging, but rather, is underpinned by a sense of the rational basis

for many of the rules at Farfield, which has often been absent in other institutions of their experience.

6. *Pupils' Perceptions of the Reasons for Their Placement at the School*

When asked to consider why they thought they had been placed in a residential special school all of the pupils questioned felt that their placement was some form of response to problems which they had experienced prior to placement. All of the pupils cited problems at former schools, some pupils (8/15) mentioned problems at home, and 4 pupils referred to delinquency out of school hours and away from home.

These pupils describe what are clearly very unhappy recollections of mainstream school. Poor educational progress and repeated failure are an almost universal experience for the boys. This is often coupled with misbehaviour in school (13/15), truancy (6/15) and poor relationships with school staff (9/15), sometimes manifesting as verbal and physical aggression by the pupil. These problems are also recalled, by many pupils, with reference to previous special schools. John describes his passage from his first "normal primary school" to a second primary school, to a children's home and to a day special school, where he was "chucked out," finally arriving at his present school 10 months prior to the interview (he is 15 years old):

I: Why did you get chucked out?

John: I think I threw a chair at one of the staff. Because they got me really annoyed. They kept phoning up my mum and winding her up. So I threw a chair at them.

I: How did they wind her up?

John: Keep phoning up and telling her that "John has just run out of school" and er [...] "just run across the main road." [...] And that really wound her up.

I: Was it true?

John: Yes.

I: What made you want to do that then?

John: They just wound me up and me mum.

I: But why did you want to run out in the first place? They could not have phoned your mum, personally, if you hadn't run out of school.

John: I just had enough of school. All the bullies there.

I: What. The kids?

John: Yes.

I: Did you chuck chairs at staff much?

John: No.

I: What did you do when you got bullied?

John: I used to run out of school and phone my mum [...]

I: What did she do?

John: She used to come up and really, really shout at them.

I: The teachers?

John: Yes.

I: What did they do?

John: Nothing. Well, they couldn't do nothing, could they? [...] 'Cos there's this big kid there and if I'd gone to tell 'em, all they say is, "don't do it again".

I: Did you ever tell them that this kid was bullying you?

John: No. Or else they'd do it again.

I: So you were frightened - in case you got bullied more.

John: Yes.

I: So you feel you got thrown out of that school because you didn't like being bullied?

John: Yes.

I: Did you like the staff there?

John: Yes I liked a few of them.

I: Did they like you?

John: Yes.

John recalls, in common with many other interviewees, considerable conflict with other people in his previous school. The impression created by John's description of the conflicts is one of an intolerable situation in which pupils, teachers and parents seem to suffer under unacceptable pressures. He is bullied, he flees from the bullies only to find his teachers treating this remedy as non co-operative behaviour; the teachers contact his mother, who reacts in a highly emotional way, which in turn places pressure on the boy to accept what he feels to be the intolerable conditions of the school. The explosion of physical violence finally breaks the circuit of torment and confusion by leading to his being "chucked out". The other actors in this drama might well present different accounts and define different motives as signals to this train of events, but for this pupil his actions are reasonable responses to a threatening situation created by those around him. This is a clear case of what Lemert (1967) describes as "secondary deviance". It is not surprising, therefore, that John claims to prefer being at this school to being at home, and that he feels this school to be "the best

place for me". In addition to these social problems, John also suggests that poor educational progress contributed to referral to his present school. This supplies further evidence of the negative nature of his school experience prior to referral, and justification for his satisfaction with his present placement, where he feels less pressurized, socially and academically.

Poor relations with family - usually mother - coupled with little motivation for, and low attainment in, school work, is a potent combination for many of these boys. Truancy, "dossing" in class, and "mucking around in school" are constantly cited as reasons for referral. Reasons for refusing to work or truanting are rarely given. However, when seeking an explanation for their referral these boys, unanimously, look to their own actions. Even John, who seems to present the image of one who has merely responded to circumstances, presents his own actions as the cause for referral. We can infer from one of Ryan's explanations a possible reason for this aspect of the boys' responses:

I: What do you think the idea behind sending people here is?

Ryan: [...] To make you better at school. I suppose, to try and learn you something.

I: So it's about your education, really?

Ryan: Yes. And my home life as well, comes into it a bit. It gives me a break from home and gives my mum a break.

I: If it's just that, surely two years is a long time. Do you think they are right to send people to place to places like this?

Ryan: Yes. I suppose so. I mean, it's changed me a lot. If I was to leave now, I'd probably be inside or something. [...] I'd have a record. But I got out of that. I've been nicked, yeah. But I ain't got a record. I got out of it. God knows how many times.

I: How did you manage that then?

Ryan: I'm not really sure. Y'know, just by saying, "I weren't that much involved." And the old girl coming down. Y'know [...]

I: Would you find it easy to explain to your mates at home why you are here?

Ryan: No.

I: How would you explain it, if you were given the opportunity?

Ryan: I wouldn't.

I: Is it because you couldn't?

Ryan: It's because I wouldn't like to.

I: How would you explain it to me?

Ryan: I don't know. I've never really thought of explaining it. [...] Because I've been bad. A trouble maker at school. Bad to me mum. You know. About every bad thing.

I: What's the idea of a place like this then? Why send someone who lives with his mum and goes to school?

Ryan: I didn't go to school. I didn't go to school regularly.

I: Did you truant?

Ryan: Yes.

I: What did they hope to achieve by sending you here?

Ryan: I dunno.

I: Was it a punishment?

Ryan: No. Not a punishment. Probably to make me better.

It is as if Ryan sees himself as having been in need of a cure for his bad behaviour. He looks no further than his own behaviour for an explanation of his need for referral to Farfield. The full weight of responsibility rests with him, owing to his own personal "badness".

Not all pupils have such a clear perception of the reasons for their placement. Colin expresses considerable confusion and bewilderment on this subject:

I: Did you ever go to an ordinary day primary school?

Colin: Well, only for a few weeks, that's all [...]. I don't know, but something happened and they put me in one of these schools.

I: Do you know why?

Colin: No. I think it was about my education. I don't know. I'm confused, you see, because some kids from my old school said, "oh, we know you, you're in our school!" And I said, "what is it? Go on tell us!" Well some kid told me; he goes, "it happened when [...] we was all in the playground. Someone pulled up a rose bush; put it in your hand. The Headmistress came out, took you in, told you off." And all this. Then a couple of days later I was sent to the [residential] school. [...] I always kept swearing and acting the hard little kid like.

[...]

I: When you were five?

Colin: Yes. That's what happened, anyway. I think it was through that. 'Cos I was bullying, at my age, y'know, small. You couldn't believe it, but that's what I've been told.

I: You were a bully?

Colin: Yes. And I used to swear at the teachers, every second [...unclear...] Then I got put away in a school, as far as I remember. I can't remember that far back, 'cos I was only a little toddler then.

In spite of his uncertainty and "confusion" as to why he was referred initially to a residential school, Colin seems certain that his behaviour warranted the need for him to be "put away". Like Ryan, Colin feels that he must have committed an offence of some kind; he must have been "bad". At a later point in this lengthy interview this topic re-emerges:

I: Why do you think that you had to stay at boarding schools for 11 years?

Colin: I haven't got a clue. You'll easily find out, 'cos my dad might have the answer to that.

I: Have you ever asked him?

Colin: Yes. But I dunno how much is the truth.

I: What have people told you?

Colin: As I said like, ripping a rose bush out. Me mates have told me that. I said, "you can't go to a boarding school, 60 miles away, just for ripping out a rose bush!" [...] And someone told me it's for swearing. I was a little brute at school. Y'know, they couldn't stand me. They couldn't control me. I was that vicious when I was small. I was like a wild dog. [...] I was really foul mouthed [...]. I used to start, "oh, fucking hell!" and all this crap, y'know. And teachers used to come in and say, "stop that! Stop that! You're only young! Stop it!" I dunno where I picked it up. I don't know if it was when I was in the flat, at my other school, when my mum and dad broke up. (I don't want them to know I've told you [...] that's nothing to do with the school like. That's personal like. They broke up when I was little, and a load of swearing went on.) I probably picked it up then. When I came to school I had a mouth, you know. And anyway, the teacher used to say, "stop swearing", and I'd shout foul mouthly to her to high heavens. Y'know. Like here, they couldn't turn around to Mr Talbot and start effing and blinding at him, would they? They'd stand there, mouths shut [...] They used to give me the slipper, like, and a clip round the ear. I used to carry on and on and on. They probably got that sick of me. They must have gone up to the authorities and said, "sorry, we can't have him with us. You've got to put him somewhere where he'll be tamed down."

Colin claims to be "confused" about the reasons for his referral, and this is clearly reflected in the above extract. He describes, in some detail, various aspects of his behaviour which might be termed "anti-social", swearing in particular, and his failure to respond positively to corrective treatment. His desire to pinpoint a specific incident, or personal fault suggests that he views his placement as something akin to a sentence,

imposed as a response to wrong doing, this is consistent with his earlier reference to "doing time". A further point of interest is supplied by Colin's reference to the break up of his parents' marriage, and the fact that, in spite of it being a possible model for his wild and uncontrollable behaviour, that this should remain a "personal" matter, of no concern to the school. Once again, this points to the fact that he holds the view that his referral is his responsibility, and his alone. In spite of his confusion, Colin appears to hold no feelings of resentment to those who may have sanctioned his referral. There is a hint of sympathy in his reference to his exasperated teachers who are unable to control the "vicious", "wild animal", that he likens himself to. This view of himself as a "brute" also suggests low self-esteem, owing to its dehumanizing connotations; although this may also be taken to suggest a certain healthy distancing of his present self from the child whose behaviour he now finds repellant and hard to comprehend.

The theme of self blame is taken up most strikingly by Alan, who sees referral as a form of punishment for misbehaviour:

I: You said earlier, "it's a bit like doing time." Do you see it as a sort of punishment that you've been sent here.

Alan: Well, sort of. I was naughty to get myself here like. I ran away from school, and that. Just punishing myself.

Like Colin, Alan shoulders the responsibility for his referral, and sees the placement as a response to his own wrong doing. Alan also exhibits confusion when seeking a reason for his removal from a day special school to Farfield:

Alan: [...] I don't think I should have come here, anyway. My dad said to me, "alright, do you want to stay at Hill Top [the day school] 'til you are 16?" I goes, "yeah, alright. I can't see [...] unclear...] anywhere else." When I said, "anywhere else", he probably thought, "ah! I'll tell the council, the er, authorities something about it." And that's how I ended up here.

It is common to all of the interviewees that reasons for referral are seen in terms of "crimes" committed by them, and requiring their removal from either school, home, or both situations. This would tend to suggest, therefore, that their placement is seen by them as a form of rejection - an observation supported by the repeated use of the terms: "put away", "doing time", "chucked out" and "sent away". Also, these terms, for the most part, are associated with ideas of imprisonment. The emphasis of all the responses on this subject stress the pupils' own negative behaviour, as opposed to the possible positive benefits of removal to a therapeutic environment.

For many pupils the process by which they are moved to their present situation is shrouded in mystery. The decision is taken by faceless "authorities", "the social services", "a man from the education authority", a nameless social worker, or simply the faceless, Kafka-esque "Them". Brian claims that the placement was his mother's choice, based on the advice of a social worker. Three other pupils are also able to identify individuals they believe to have made the decision. Two boys from the same area name the same educational psychologist, whilst one boy - also from the same authority - names the authority's placements officer (who happens to be a not infrequent visitor to Farfield).

The pupils' personal involvement in the process of referral also appears to be extremely limited, with consultation over choice of placement being at best cursory and at worst non-existent. The four pupils who identified the people who chose Farfield for them, all claimed to have been consulted as to whether or not they wished to attend Farfield, after an initial visit. One of these boys, Alex, claims that he told the psychologist that he did not wish to go to Farfield. Four other boys say they were consulted by the school principal, on their initial visits to the school. The remaining boys (7/15) claim not to have been consulted at all. This seems to conflict with the school's stated policy of "gaining a commitment from the child and his parents to support the school and its aims" (*Headteacher's Document*, p.1). For some pupils, in fact, their arrival at Farfield is their earliest realization of their enrollment:

I: Did anybody ever ask you if you wanted to come here?

Alan: Not really. One day, my old key worker at Spenser House [previous placement] [...] turned up [...] I said, "right, where am I going?" She goes, "oh, don't worry about that, just get your watch and clothes ready for tomorrow. Make sure nothing's broken. Get your clothes in your bag." I didn't know where I was going. [...] [...] I don't normally wear a watch when we go out normally, but she said put my watch on then. So since then I've always kept my watch on, except for night.

* * * * *

Colin: [...] One Monday I got up, and as I was lined up for school Uncle Fred [a residential social worker at Colin's former school] came over - he was brilliant - he goes, "er, Colin, come with me." I says, "O.K. Am I going to the dentist or something?" He goes, "no. I've got a surprise for you." "A surprise!" I says. He gets in, like, where the head's office is - it's outside, and it smells of beautiful brewed coffee. I can't figure it out like. Anyway, it goes on. I keep mouthing, "what's going on? Go on, tell us!" "Alright then. Your dad's coming

down." "God! Is that all? My dad's coming down to see me!" "No. It's a surprise." Anyway, my dad comes down with this lady in a Citroen. They goes, "come on. We're going out!" I goes, "Brill! Where?" "We're going to visit a new school!" I goes, "are you trying to be funny? I've been at this school for 5 years and you want to move me for my last year!"

I: Who was the person in the Citroen?

Colin: I don't know. Some social worker from [home borough].

I: You're social worker.

Colin: I dunno. Just the school social worker who moves people.

* * * * *

Greg: I didn't know I was coming to Farfield on the same day [...]. It gave me a bit of a shock, really. They goes, "it's quite a few miles out." I goes, "where's that?" I didn't know where it was at first, when Joe [present key worker] brought me [...]. I thought it would be one of those lock up places.

These three boys give a strong impression of their bewilderment at being transported to a strange destination, by strange people, for only vaguely known purposes! All three are surprisingly compliant and trusting. Common to all three accounts is the suggestion that details of the destination are deliberately withheld from the boys. Couple with the confusions and guilt feelings already discussed, such a situation as this must be potentially highly traumatic.

In spite of what would appear to be, for most pupils, an insensitively handled introduction to Farfield, it would seem, from what we have already seen, that the boys' fears are fairly soon allayed. The favourable first impressions the boys have have of Farfield have been demonstrated already. It is a failing of the referring agencies to, on

occasions, prepare pupils for their new school, and not, it would seem, the fault of the Farfield staff.

It would seem that these often unhappy introductions have no lasting significance for pupils and their perception of Farfield. When asked about what they believe the school sets out to achieve for its pupils all pupils cite positive aims. In keeping with the emergent notion that these boys often seem to see themselves at fault prior to entering Farfield, which is suggestive of low self-image, all the boys interviewed believe that Farfield aims to affect some form of improvement in their behaviour or level of educational achievement, and they see this improvement as personally desirable. Pupils (8/15) also believe that an aim of the school is to keep them "out of trouble" (6/15), and it achieves this by distancing them from their home towns, and, therefore, home based negative influences. Another perceived (6/15) aim of placing them at a distance from their families is the relief it offers to strained family relationships. A further commonly mentioned (12/15) aim of the school is to provide pupils with a new perspective on the "problems", through relationships with staff and pupils; sometimes aided by the peace and quiet of the environment.

It is clear then, that in spite of confusions about particular reasons for placement at Farfield and other residential schools, the majority of boys interviewed feel that on entering the school they were in some sense damaged, or otherwise disordered or impaired. Whatever the reasons for referral the boys expect Farfield to facilitate some sort of

positive change in them. To what extent the boys perceive the school to be success in this endeavour is dealt with in the next section.

7. The Pupils' Perceptions of the Personal Effects of Their Placements

An outstanding feature of the interviews is the fact that , without exception, they contain claims for the positive effects of their experience of Farfield. This is not to say that all pupils feel all of their experience of Farfield to be of benefit to them. Even those pupils who claim to dislike the school and wish to leave because of this (3/15), however, find some positive benefits resulting from their placement at Farfield.

Colin has a great deal to say about the effects of being at Farfield:

I: Do you think Farfield has done you any good?

Colin: Yes! I've improved in everything!

[...]

Silliness. I probably just do a little bit now and then now. I've packed in silliness. What I mean by silly is I used to, in my old school - they used to get sick of me like, 'cos if we had a member of staff who was, like, an old lady, [...] what I used to do - that the other kids kept on laughing at - is that I used to go up to her and give her a goodnight kiss. [...] And I kept on cuddling everybody - all the staff - the old ladies and that. That was my silly behaviour - kept on every minute of the day. After break I used to go off and go, "morning Auntie Irene!" [snaps fingers] As soon as I hit the school gates [of Farfield] it just stopped! Like it was just a

bit of wind, like. Just blew away.

The colourful simile, with which this extract ends, indicates graphically the sense of relief which Colin claims to have felt as a result of moving from what he perceives as the oppressive regime at his former boarding school, to the more relaxed atmosphere of Farfield:

I: Why do you think that was?

Colin: I dunno. It's just the school. It's easy going. It's more relaxed. Y'know you can enjoy yourself. [...]
It's more free in this school. At Spencer House you were so blocked in. All together in one common room. You know, when you wanted to watch T.V., you got about two members of staff sitting down, and 50 kids in a room. This was where me silliness came in. You go to them: smack on the back. They'd say, "Miss! Someone's hit me on the back!" Y'know, all this. And we used to tickle their feet then look at the T.V., and all that. Then other kids used to start like. That was the silly behaviour: keep on irritating people.

I: Because you were kept down all the time?

Colin: All packed in. Y'know. Like a package. You're put in and stopped in there. As soon as I came here, I felt like the wrapping was chucked away. I was free! Walk out and do anything you like!

Colin possesses considerable insight into the causes of his perceived misbehaviour. Far from seeing the increased freedom as a licence for irresponsible behaviour, he sees it as a soothing, calming influence. Colin feels that he no longer behaves in a childish and "silly" fashion, because he is no longer repressed; no longer in need of an outlet for his repressed feelings. He believes that increased freedom has led to his becoming more responsible and mature. This is an analysis of which A.S. Neill would have approved!

The belief that the school provides an environment conducive to personal development and improvement, because of one or more of the following: the friendliness of the other pupils; its relaxed atmosphere; the caring attitudes of staff; and the willingness of staff to listen to pupils and treat them with understanding; is a recurring theme common to many of the interviews (13/15). Malcolm's words on this subject are of particular interest, not least because of his generally negative attitude towards the school and his desire to leave:

I: Do you think going to a place like Farfield helps you Malcolm?

Malcolm: It helps me [pause] to talk to some people. Sometimes I have to pluck up the courage.

I: So how does this place help you to talk to people?

Malcolm: Well, it's the kids here. First time I was here, er, I was laughing and joking with other kids. I got to know the staff.

I: Was Farfield better than your other schools for that?

Malcolm: Yeah, 'cos at the other school [comprehensive] you couldn't really call them by their first names. Some of the staff you can here.

I: So it's more pleasant here?

Malcolm: Yeah. Better than Blackford Comprehensive.

I: Is there anything that the school has done for you, that you'll remember?

Malcolm: Only calmed me down [...] 'cos it's quiet; more relaxed. Like fishing. I like to get some fishing in at the weekend. But other than that, I don't think [it has helped] [...] It's helped me a bit with my school.

I: Has it been worth it?

Malcolm: Not really.

I: What would you rather have done?

Malcolm: Probably gone to a normal school.

I: Do you think you'd have solved your problems doing that?

Malcolm: I don't know.

Earlier (see section 1) we have seen how Malcolm dislikes being removed from his home environment, and he complains of Farfield being "too quiet". Here, however, we find the peace and quiet of the environment being cited as having a therapeutic value. It is also interesting that he compares the peace of the area to that of fishing: his hobby which he states (section 1) he would prefer to compulsory schooling. He also describes the good relationships with staff and pupils as a benefit. Finally, he refers to the positive educational progress he believes himself to have made since being at the school. So, in spite of Malcolm's apparent dislike of the school, he believes himself to have made gains socially, behaviourally and academically, and he attributes these gains to his experience of Farfield. These gains would certainly coincide with the official aims of the school. Malcolm's combination of feelings about Farfield, although surprising, are not necessarily contradictory. Whilst Malcolm finds the environment conducive to reflection and in many other ways suited to some of his needs, there are other (unspecified) needs which the environment clearly fails to provide for him; these are to be found in the home environment to which he longs to return, and where he will live. It might even be argued that Malcolm's lack of attachment to Farfield is a thoroughly healthy response, and the fact that he is able to separate his feelings for Farfield from his perception of its effects, may enhance the chances of the personal benefits he has gained, being carried over into the home environment.

Alex admits to having initially shared Malcolm's perception of the negative aspects of life at the school, but seems to have changed his view as a result of the positive personal benefits that he has achieved:

I: So you didn't want to come here.

Alex: No!

I: I came and had a look. You see, if I hadn't come here anyway, I'd have been put away.

I: Where?

Alex: I dunno. Mr Talbot said I could have been put away until I was 18. Inside. When I come here [...] I came here with my mum and her boyfriend, and they kept us [me] here, the day I come [...] They wouldn't let me go back.

I: Did you want to go back?

Alex: Yes. I asked 'em.

I: What did they say?

Alex: No! [...] I went mad! [...] I told Mr Talbot to go somewhere. I started shouting. I didn't like it [...] being away from home.

I: When you were shown round the school, what did you think of it?

Alex: I thought it was crap! I thought it was stupid!

I: What didn't you like about it?

Alex: I dunno, it was just different [...] I didn't like living with other people. I didn't think I'd get where I am now. [...] 'Cos I've caught up really a lot since I've been here.

I: What, with your school work?

Alex: Yeah! Really caught up [...].

I: But obviously, you did settle down, didn't you? How did you manage that?

Alex: I just worked right into it [...]. I tried as best I could. Put everything I had into it.

I: What would've happened if you hadn't tried as hard as you did?

Alex: I'd just be bad stil, probably. [...] I'd be what I was a year ago.

I: So being here has changed you? How have you changed?

Alex: Yeah, a lot [...] It's helped me a lot. People I can talk to.

I: People here?

Alex: Yeah, they've helped me [...] [I've talked about] problems at home. They give me advice sometimes. When they can they help me.

I: Have you ever had people before to talk to?

Alex: Yeah, I have, but I never used to say anything. 'Cos I was at home then. I weren't bothered about what I done. Probably 'cos I was mixed up when I first come here.

Alex clearly values the improvements, he believes himself to have undergone since being at Farfield, far ~~the~~ above the negative aspects of residential life. He believes he has made educational gains, as well as behavioural gains. Removal from the home environment, where he admits to having been "mixed up", to a place where he feels able and inclined to talk about his problems are positive moves for Alex. Later, he refers to the relationship he has with his key worker, who he describes as "going with me all the way", through problem situations. He clearly values the support and guidance provided by his key worker and the school as a whole, which have provided a secure basis on which to challenge the difficulties he has faced. Alex also believes, however, that his own determination to make a success of his stay at Farfield has been important. We sense improvements in his self-esteem as a result of this experience. Alex also describes positive changes in his family relationships, which he attributes to his experience at Farfield:

I: Since you^{ve} been coming here, have you found any differences in the way you get on at home?

Alex: Oh yeah, a lot. 'Cos I didn't really like knowing my family. Now I miss 'em, and all that. We do things together that we'd never dream of doing [before] [...] Going out together. Little things.

I: So it's been good, having a bit of separation?

Alex: Yeah. Yes.

I: Has anything this school ^{has} done helped you get on better with your family?

Alex: Yeah! [...] The school's put me in a different way, y'know. It's made me look at things different. [...] I didn't get on with my mum and brothers. And I used to argue with my mum. That's just stopped now. There's things that I wouldn't do, like say I have a little argument with my mum now, I'll say sorry to her after. That's one thing I wouldn't even thought of doing when I was at home before.

According to Alex then, just as his attitude to the school has changed from one of dislike to one of acceptance and appreciation, so his attitude towards his family has moved from one of antagonism and aggression towards one of consideration and a desire to resolve conflicts in a harmonious way. It is ironic that separation from the family has brought him closer to the family. He now believes himself to be more thoughtful and sensitive towards his family, and more thoughtful about his own behaviour. There is a strong implication here that through work with his key worker, and his own efforts to come to terms with difficulties that he has developed strategies for dealing in a positive way with problematic situations. There is also a suggestion that the family also have altered their behaviour towards one another in a positive way, since Alex has been at Farfield.

Ryan is another pupil who believes that the school has changed him "a lot", and for the better. His assessment of these changes is, characteristically, down to earth, and accompanied by sometimes self effacing qualifying remarks:

Ryan: Farfield has changed me a lot. If I was at home now I'd probably be inside or something. [...] I'd have a record [...] I've been nicked, but I've got out of it [...]

I: Is that anything to do with being here?

Ryan: Yes, I think so. It's straightened me out really. 'Cos I know - I want to get into the Army now. I found out something that upset me lately, is that this place is a disadvantage to me getting in the Army. Which is something I was never told.
[...]

I: You say the school has helped you though.

Ryan: [...] It's straightened me out really. [...] It's made me look at things I suppose. It's made me think, "if I do this thing, I'll be stupid." [...] I think it's made me more sensible. I know there's a bunch of kids, some old mates, who if I hang around with, I'll get nicked. Or I'll do a job, get away with it, then get nicked. But I don't bother hanging around with them no more, because I know it will bodge up my life with the Army. Before, I wouldn't have really thought of it.

I: But you are older now. Do you think you would have come to that conclusion anyway?

Ryan: No. I think I would be worse now. [...] As you get older jobs get bigger, don't they? [...]

I: Is it simply because you've been away from them for a long time?

Ryan: Yes. That could be one of the reasons.

The very practical notion that certain forms of deviant behaviour "bodge up" peoples' lives, is a simple but vital realization for Ryan. It is interesting to note, also, that Ryan does not blame the school for being an

impediment to his career ambitions, but rather, seems to see this fact as some sort of lesson; indicating to him the error of his former ways. Ryan sees himself as, to some extent, a reformed character, owing to the way in which Farfield has helped him to "look at things", and to see the harm his behaviour can do to him. This does not mean that he is completely "reformed", as we saw earlier (section 4), he still admits to what he sees as petty crime, when he says that he has received stolen goods (see section, 4). It will be remembered, however, that Ryan claims to restrict these activities, because he does not wish to jeopardize the relationship he has with his key worker. This shows how such relationships might be instrumental in leading boys like Ryan and Alex towards the types of changes they have described. It is also worth noting that these two boys share the same key worker.

Whilst the caring attitudes of staff and the harmonious relationships which many children share with staff and boys can contribute to a general sense of satisfaction with the school, and both social and academic progress, some pupils (7/15) feel that the very fact of their being isolated from their home environments with boys in similar situations, with similar "problems" provides important advantages. For Jim these factors are of particular significance:

I: What was your last school [a day junior school] like? Did you like it there?

Jim: No [...] I didn't get on with the headteacher. I was getting trouble [...] for cheeking, messing around, not doing my work, playing my mum and dad up.

I: Were you unhappy?

Jim: Yes.

I: So how does being at Fairfield compare to that?

Jim: Better [...] I get on with staff better. I've settled down with my mum and dad a bit. And I think I've improved a bit.

I: In what ways have you improved?

Jim: In class.

I: Behaviour?

Jim: Yes.

I: And you say you've improved in how you get on with your parents? Is that anything to do with what's gone on here?

Jim: Yes. Me being away from home. [...] The kids here [...] They've cheered me up a couple of times when I've been unhappy. If I've been home for a weekend and it's gone wrong, they cheer me up when I come back. [...] Staff as well. [...] Miss O'Neil (RSW), my key worker, has a chat with me when I come back. [...] What have I been doing, did I see my mates, how's my sister?

For Jim, both staff and boys provide a therapeutic service, in that they provide him with an emotional pick-me-up after sometimes stressful weekend visits home. Their simple inquiries about his weekend and general friendliness, enable him to "cheer up". This helps him to weather the storms which inevitably brew during the difficult voyage towards improved relationships with his parents. For this boy then, the school is a place where his battered self-esteem can be restored through the successes he believes he has achieved in areas of former failure: in his behaviour in class, and his relations with staff, and through the experience he has of being valued as an individual by peers and staff, particularly at times when his view of self-worth has suffered. Ryan sees the effects of separation from his mother in less complex terms:

I: Would you say there's been any change in you getting on with your mother since being here?

Ryan: Yes. It's got a lot better. But it's still bad.

I: Has being here helped it get better?

Ryan: I think it's got better because we've spent longer times apart. It's nothing what I've said or what I've been told to say. I reckon it's the break. When I go home for long periods it starts again.

John shares Ryan's belief in the therapeutic value of separation from his mother, though he sees the benefit mainly in terms of the respite it provides for his mother - thus recognizing himself as a source of stress in the family home:

I: Do you think that being here has helped you, in any way, to cope better with home?

John: Yes. [...] I help my mum at home. I do everything I can.

I: Did you do that before you came to Farfield?

John: No.

I: Why do you think you've changed, then?

John: [...] The school's helped me change by helping my mum.
[...] By me coming here, she can have a rest. Now she's got a month's rest, I can go home now.

I: Do you get on better with your mum now than you did before you came here?

John: Yes. Definitely.

John is quite clear about the way in which the school has catered for his own needs by supplying those of his mother.

Ten of the 15 boys interviewed described poor relationships with their families, and with mothers in particular (7/15). Out of these, 7 claim to be getting on better with their families since being at Farfield,

2 report no change, and one boy describes the situation at home as having broken down to the extent that he is hoping to find foster parents. In addition to those who feel that improvements are due to fewer opportunities for conflict caused by decreased frequency of contact, there is a strong indication that for some boys improvements are owing to changes in boys' attitudes to their families. We have already seen how Alex, Mick, and Ian claim to value their families more highly, and have adjusted their behaviour to their families accordingly.

Of course, not all the effects of residential schooling at Farfield, described by these boys, are positive. Amid the generally positive remarks about the personal effects are some interesting points, which show ways in which the efforts of the school to secure improvements have unintended negative consequences. Once again, Ryan's interview provides material in support of this point:

I: What about all the reports you get written about you?

Ryan: You get some [...] teachers who write home to your mum saying, "he's bad in class. He keeps tapping on his desk, and singing." [...] Who get you an absolute bollocking off your mum, when you get home! [...]

I: Do you think the reports are accurate?

Ryan: Yes. Most of them are fairly accurate. Most of them are true, yeah. [...] The report my teacher done me, about tapping on the desk and that, weren't helpful to my home life. Put it that way.

This point, evidently, is of particular personal significance to Ryan, especially when we note that the disharmony he perceives in his relationship with his mother to be a major personal difficulty.

Another pupil, Chris, believes that Farfield has helped him to keep out of trouble at home by providing him with the knowledge that he "can have fun without spending money". He now plays table tennis at a local club when he's at home, a pastime he would not have considered before learning to play the game at Farfield. Consequently, he uses his spare time more profitably and claims that, as a result, he has given up glue sniffing. These positive outcomes are for him overshadowed, however, by what he sees as his unsatisfactory educational progress. He blames this on the failure of his teachers to provide him with sufficiently demanding work. Mick, like Alex, on the other hand, believes that the school has helped him to make good educational progress. Unlike Alex, however, Mick feels that his unsatisfactory behaviour has remained unchanged. His explanation for this is his own determined resistance to staff efforts to make these changes.

Another important area in the lives of these boys that is affected adversely, by their removal from their home situations, is that of peer group relationships. It has already been demonstrated, notably by Ryan, that the breaking of ties with delinquent home based peers is seen as contributing to some boys' progress away from a delinquent career. There is, however, another side to this situation: that lengthy absences from home and diminished frequency of contact with former friends can lead to feelings of isolation and alienation. Lewis describes his own experience of this in terms of having to "get to know them [former friends] again" at each visit. Ryan illustrates the emotional effects of this situation graphically:

I: Do you miss anything by being at Farfield?

Ryan: [...] I miss my mates.

I: And yet you said earlier, it's not a totally bad thing that you're away from them.

Ryan: No, not all of them. It's just the bad lot.

I: So, being here, how has that affected your relationships with the people back home?

Ryan: Quite a lot. I can still remember one time I went home. I went all round town looking for 'em one night. I couldn't find no-one around. Y'know, I didn't know where the latest hang-out place was, 'cos I hadn't been there for ages. [...] It made me feel really pissed off. When I got home, of course, my mum got the worst of it.

I: You took it out on her?

Ryan: Yes. I was moody, y'know.

It is not only Ryan's trouble-making "mates" with whom contact is lost through prolonged absence at Farfield, but also those mates who are not delinquent. Once again, the running sore of Ryan's emotional life - his stormy relationship with his mother - is irritated by his reaction to this disappointment, which is perceived as a direct "side effect" of the generally effective remedy to Ryan's difficulties.

Ian's background has many features in common with the histories of other boys at the school. Prior to attending Farfield he spent some months at a residential observation and assessment centre, near to his home. He believes he was sent there because he "didn't do [his school] work", and he "kept mucking around with mates" at his comprehensive school. Like Ryan, he also speaks of family problems at home: "I didn't get on with my mum." Like Ryan, he feels that relationships with some members of his family have improved, owing to his being away:

Since I've been coming to this school, me and my mum seem to be getting on much better now. We can sit down and talk to one another; yet before we couldn't. We always used to row all the time.

Ian believes himself to be happy at the school and says he has made some good friends:

I: What do you think Farfield has done for you?

Ian: It's helped my mum out. Like, when I've been here I've been sorting myself out. And I must be sorting myself out there [...] Since this last year we've been getting on well. It's got to the stage now where me and my mum have really got on well. I can go home every weekend, if I want to. She's given me the front door key, so I can go home if I want to. Mr Talbot says I could as well. So it's not too bad now.

This apparently highly positive state of affairs is not, however, without serious flaws which threaten to hamper further progress:

I: So you do like going home then?

Ian: Sometimes I don't feel like it. Sometimes if I feel like it I go. If I don't I just stay here.

I: For what reasons do you not feel like it?

Ian: There's the travelling. And there's really nothing for me to do at home. Just sit in the house, bored. I don't want to go out much, 'cos I haven't got any good mates. They all gets in trouble. There's only about two or three of them, and I don't hardly see them much.

Like Ryan, Ian no longer wishes to involve himself with former friends who "gets in trouble" by "breaking windows" and "sniffing glue". For Ian, however, unlike Ryan, there is no alternative non-delinquent peer group to which he can turn. Consequently, Ian is less attracted to going home at weekends, and is, therefore, not building, as much as he could, on the

positive advance that have been made in his relationships with his mother and elder sister.

The personal effects of residential schooling, are described by these boys, in terms of positive attitudinal and behavioural changes. Although the particular environment of the school and the distance it places between the boys and their homes is often seen to be a positive feature of the school, we have seen that there are negative consequences attached to this, particularly that of isolation and alienation from the home based peer group. There is a further related problem, which also manifests itself in feelings of alienation, and is described by several boys (4/15); this is the problem of social stigma. These boys' describe the problem of stigma as arising chiefly among their home based peers. Brian speaks very simply and directly about this problem:

I: Do you have many friends at home?

Brian: No. [...] I've got none because I've been in boarding schools.

Brian believes that the opportunity to make friends in his home locality has been denied him simply because he has been denied regular and frequent access to his family home since he was of primary school age. However, the situation has not been alleviated in spite of increasingly regular and lengthy home visits which he has made during the 7 months prior to the interview. This is not an area of discussion that Brian wished to pursue, therefore, no detailed opinion on this subject was forthcoming. Colin, however, who shares a very similar life history with Brian, having spent a similar amount of time in often the same residential schools, and coming

from different areas of the same large city, describes the difficulties he has had in relating to neighbours and children of a similar age living nearby his family home. Colin claims that neighbours (adults as well as children) describe him as "mental". They physically avoid him, and will not speak to him. On at least two occasions Colin claims to have been cruelly rejected by children when he has approached them, on the grounds that their parents have told them to stay away from him. Colin's mother and sister (in informal conversation with the writer) corroborate his claims, saying that Colin's placement in a residential provision has been the subject of malicious gossip among the neighbours, who commonly believe Colin to have "mental problems".

Colin's situation is unique in its extremity, among the Farfield sample. However, a surprisingly large number (7/15) of the boys claimed to have no friends at home, or unsatisfactory friends. Whilst this is not necessarily indicative of the effects of stigma, it is interesting to note that even among boys who claim to have maintained what they feel to be satisfactory contacts with home-based peers, we find evidence of the stigmatizing effects of their placement in a boarding school (4/15). Mick describes, with some irritation, the way in which his friends at home "take the Micky" out of him and accuse him of attending "the nutty school". Mick does not counter these jibes with denials, but rather retaliates with descriptions of the superior material comforts which he enjoys at Farfield and that he believes are denied to his friends at home.

Ryan also experiences a more subtle version of this treatment, or thinks that he does! Ryan is clearly very sensitive to the unspoken ideas

which his friends at home *might* have about Fairfield. And whether his fears and suspicions are real or imagined their emotional effects on Ryan are real:

I: Is it easy to pick up with your mates where you left off?

Ryan: No. I feel completely different now, 'cos I'm at a boarding school and their at normal school. I'm not sure whether they treat me different, but I always get questions when I go home, like "what's it like?"

I: How do you feel about these questions?

Ryan: Well, I don't like it much, especially when they treat us [me] nice. They say, "alright Ry, we'll buy you some chips," and all this. I don't like that really 'cos [...] they think they're being good because Ryan's just got out. Y'know, like, "we'll treat him."

I: [...] Like you've just got out of prison [...] on parole?

Ryan: I reckon that's what they think, anyway. Most of my mates know it's not like that, 'cos I've told 'em. I still think that's the way they see it. 'Cos I go home so little don't I? It'd be different if I was at home every weekend like.

I: Does that interfere with the way you get on with them?

Ryan: No. I just don't like it when they treat me nicer than normal. Same as my old girl.

I: She treats you different too?

Ryan: If we have a row, next time I go home it'll be, "hello, Ryan, are you alright?" [...] I hate it. Especially when they act different from what they normally are. [...] Like they're putting on an act. But they are genuinely trying to be nice. They're being nice 'cos they think I ain't around much no more [...]. I'm not sure what they think, but I think they make it nice for me 'cos they think I won't be there much anymore. I gotta go back soon - something like that.

I: How does that affect the way you behave toward them?

Ryan: Oh, I behave normal to them. But I have to be on my guard though, I mean. I still think that if I stutter while I'm talking to them, that that'll give them a reason to think why I'm here. [...] They ain't really got an idea what I'm here for [...]. They used to know the way I got on with

my mum, and [that] I got nicked a couple of times. The thing I'd hate them to think is that it's a place for people who ain't got a lot up top. So I'm always on my guard.

Ryan gives the impression that being with his friends at home, places him constantly on the defensive: guarding his sense of self-esteem. His self esteem is threatened on several fronts. He does not wish to be thought of as a prisoner, or as mentally subnormal, or in any way deprived. However, neither does he want his friends to know what he believes to be the real reasons for his referral to Farfield: what he defines as his all round "badness". He believes that any of these images, if they were attached to him by his friends, would diminish him in their eyes, and make him less acceptable to them as a friend. At the same time, as we have seen earlier, Ryan believes that the true purpose of the school is to help him to "get better", and he believes it has helped him. To tell his friends this, however, would require him to divulge his worst secret:

I: Would you find it easy to explain to your mates, why you are here?

Ryan: No. [...] I wouldn't [want to]. [...] It's because I wouldn't like to [...] It's because I've been bad. A trouble maker at school. Bad to my mum. You know about every bad thing.

For some pupils the stigma takes a slightly different form.

Les's friends are convinced that he goes to a "snobbish school", much to his professed embarrassment. Les, like Ryan and Mick, does not directly argue against these misconceptions, but, like Mick, he emphasises what he believes to be the positive aspects of Farfield, particularly the high quality of staff-pupil relationships. Although Les's experience of stigma

would seem to be qualitatively different from that described by Ryan and Colin, the effects are identical: placing barrier between the stigmatized individual and those with whom he might ordinarily expect to interact; a barrier which impedes social participation (see Goffman, 1968).

In spite of the problem of stigma, surprisingly few of the boys (3/15) said that they were ashamed to admit to people in the town that they attended Farfield School. This is surprising when we consider the antagonism which is said to exist between the Farfield boys and local youth (see above). Some boys (4/15) did admit to being selective in their choice of who in the town they would tell, but the majority (8/15) said that they would tell anyone. It must be stated that in a town of 7,000, it would be difficult to conceal the fact that one was associated with the town's only EBD residential school, whose staff, pupils and mini-buses are regular visitors to the town centre. Where such limitations as to the opportunity to sustain a "cover story" are not present, however, things might be different. Jim's parents' recent removal from one area of the country to another has presented him with an opportunity to construct an image of his educational arrangements that suits him: "I say I go to a boarding school". He deliberately says no more than this when his new neighbours inquire about his lengthy term-time absences from his home area. This particular cover story is aided by the fact that his parents (publicans) might be construed to have the means to support a son at a fee paying school. Similarly, Ian states that he would "never" tell a girl in his home town of the nature of Farfield, for fear of rejection on the grounds of being a "trouble maker".

Even when the boys do talk to their friends about the school, they seem to avoid describing the educational purposes of the establishment. More often than not the boys are at pains to present a glamorized and idealized image of the school, possibly as a counter to underlying feelings of stigma. Thus Mick, a self confessed hater of Farfield, tells his friends that he "prefers to be at school. It's a good place"! To back this up he recounts the material riches of the school. Chris, when describing the school to peers emphasises the foreign holidays enjoyed by the pupils. He claims that this has made some of his home-based friends envious. Ian, in a similar vein, tells his friends that Farfield is "like a holiday camp"! It would seem that these material and recreational aspects of the school serve to bolster the self-images of some of the boys. As was noted earlier (section 1), the high quality of the facilities plays an important part in the boys' first impressions of the school: at a time when they feel confused and perhaps uncared for, the physical quality of the school helps to give them a sense of being valued and cared for. And when confronted by children who have not been "sent away", the threats to the Farfield boys' sense of self esteem, which might be enacted by focusing on their unusual living arrangements, can be parried by reference to these same material qualities.

When it comes to a consideration of the longer term effects of their residential experience, these boys are less certain in their views. All the boys expect to return to their home environments. Brian, Colin, Lewis, Mick, Chris, Ian and Dave expect to return to their parental homes. Colin looks forward to this prospect with eagerness, and already

has a place on a YTS course. Brian and Chris, however, foresee potential difficulties. Brian foresees that "things will be rough sometimes", owing to tensions that still exist between himself and his family, particularly his brother and mother. Chris, with reluctance but quite bluntly, says that he expects to be a "trouble maker all my life". He also doubts the long term stability of his relationship with his family. Alex and Jim, in spite of the improvements they describe in their family relationships, intend to live away from their family homes: Alex, with his "mum's boyfriend"; Jim with his mother (Jim's father has custody of the children from his marriage to Jim's mother, after their separation). Both of these boys feel that life at the family home would be ultimately disastrous. Greg, who lives in a children's home, expects to leave school and to go into a flat of his own, though he candidly fears the barren loneliness of a "little flat with nothing in it". Malcolm looks forward to sharing a flat with his girlfriend, when he leaves (the day after the interview), he believes his relationship with his mother to be irretrievable.

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, it seems fair to say that the vast majority of pupils believe that the school has provided them with many positive and valuable experiences that have enabled them to tackle personal difficulties in an effective and constructive manner. These are difficulties of an immediate individual nature, as well social difficulties which often relate

to the boys' families. A prime means by which the school is perceived by the pupils to achieve these ends is through the high quality of staff-pupil relationships which are engendered by the school. The pupils feel valued and supported by the staff, by and large. Another important source of security is to be found in the informal network of pupil relationships, which seems to some extent to reflect the caring and supportive values of the staff, with evidence of pupils sharing a sense of care and responsibility for one another. Whilst many boys, according to their own recollections, appear to enter the school with poor self-images, the school, through what the pupils perceive of as its high level of material provision, as well as the network of supportive interpersonal relationships, helps many pupils to develop improved self images. These initially negative self images are encouraged and partly developed as a result of the often insensitively handled transfer and referral procedures. This leaves many pupils with uncertainty about the reasons for their referral, and some with an underlying sense of guilt that they have committed a crime demanding a custodial sentence. In spite of these difficulties the school seems to be successful in persuading pupils of its therapeutic intentions. Whilst the school's considerable distance from pupils' home areas offers pupils and their families respite from relationships dogged with conflict, and pupils respite from negative school experiences and delinquent home peer groups, it also leads to feelings of alienation and isolation from potentially valuable peers. This can interfere with the therapeutic endeavours of the school and is related to feelings of stigma described by some pupils. In spite of these negative consequences the overwhelming impression given is that the pupils find the school to be a satisfying and supportive environment which enables them to

make effective personal progress in accordance with the professed therapeutic aims of the school.

9. *Some Theoretical Considerations Relating to the Fairfield Study*

It is the purpose of this section to draw out some of the significant theoretical considerations outlined in the in chapters one and two of this thesis, and to relate them to the more specifically to the Fairfield study. A second purpose is to introduce further theoretical considerations which are seen by the writer as arising from, or "grounded" in (Glaser and Strauss, 1968), the data so far presented. This section will enable us to embark on the Lakeside study, with some sharply defined theoretical pointers, that have been honed on the Fairfield study. This section will consider, in relation the Fairfield study, the work of Goffman (1961), concerning Total Institutions, Olweus's (1984) theories relating to "bullies and whipping boys", labelling theory as an explanation for the social construction of deviant identities (Rist, 1977; Hargreaves et al., 1975), the issue of "freedom" in education as proposed by pioneer workers with EBD children (Neill, 1962; Shaw, 1965; Burn 1956), and perspectives on the organizational and interpersonal correlates of classroom disruption, (Hargreaves, 1967; Tattum, 1982; Woods, 1984; Gillham, 1984; Reynolds, 1984), with a view to applying an organizational model to Fairfield (Perrow, 1979; Handy, 1981).

The major contention of Goffman's work on "Total Institutions" is that regardless of the officially avowed aims of various total institutions, all such institutions share in common the tendency for bureaucratic and organizational needs to take precedence over the human needs of staff and inmates. Consequently, fundamental human needs for individual recognition and consideration are denied in the interests of orderliness, standardization and organizational efficiency; this makes the dehumanization of inmates, and the desensitization of staff two major features of total institutions. In his detailed descriptions of the characteristics of total institutions, Goffman cites a number of activities which come under the heading of "curtailments of self". Curtailments of the self are experiences which the inmates undergo in order to reinforce the fact that they are in an institution which is removed from the outside world.

The first curtailment of self described Goffman is the barrier which is placed by the institution between the institution and the inmate's private world, outside the institution. The Farfield study reveals that many interviewees had initial feelings of homesickness and a desire to leave the school for home. The school, however, as a matter of policy, required pupils to remain in the school for a continuous period (usually 6 weeks) before being permitted their first home visit. Another way in which total institutions establish this "barrier" is through the performance of certain formal administrative functions, known as "admission procedures". The institution of a written inmate record is described by Goffman as a common procedure. Whilst this is the case at Farfield, none of the the pupils interviewed described this event. Rather, the admission procedure

at Farfield, according to pupils, usually, though not always, consists of an interview with the principal. The idea of a separation from the pupils' previous lifestyle is remarked upon by pupils. This often takes the form of parting from a parent or official from a referring agency, and clearly, for many pupils marks the moment when they become officially enrolled at Farfield. It is the moment when the pupils' realize that responsibility for their day to day care has passed from one individual or institution to Farfield. Whilst the lack of formal standardization is absent from pupils' accounts of this procedure, the lack of consultation and explanation, of which many pupils complain, is very much in keeping with the view Goffman presents of the inmate as a dehumanized object to be moved and serviced according to the inclinations of the institution's staff.

Another part of the admission procedure, by which the individual is given an institutional identity is the placement of the individual into a particular category or categories. Once again this takes place without consulting the inmate. At Farfield this also happens: pupils are assigned to either senior or junior status, to a class, a key worker group and a bedroom. Only the allocation of bedrooms is remarked upon in negative terms by some pupils (Lewis, Alex, Colin and Les), who complain at having to share bedrooms with strangers for the first time in their lives.

At Farfield the formal consequences of being assigned junior or senior status are significant. This designation pervades many aspects of a pupil's life in the school. Greater freedom and privileges are afforded to seniors than juniors in the following areas of school life: out of school activities, unstructured "free time", the size and composition of dormitory

groups (seniors tend to sleep in smaller groups), jobs and the degree of responsibility exercised in the house, bedtimes, freedom to leave the school grounds unaccompanied, and access to various recreational facilities. Whilst this status is generally determined by age, social and maturational factors, as perceived by Farfield staff, are also taken into account; this is particularly the case with the "cabbages", some of whom are never given senior status. On the other hand pupils who are at the top of the pupil hierarchy (the "Joes", who do "jobs" under the direction of the principal) also receive special privileges.

This question of "junior" and "senior" status is particularly pertinent to the present study, since it draws our attention to central differences between the present study and the work of Goffman. Goffman's work deals exclusively with institutions catering for adult inmate populations. He points out that many of the rules and restrictions to which inmates of total institutions are subjected would be seen as infringements of *adult* status outside the institution. By implication many of these infringements would be less remarkable if applied to children. This is perhaps why certain "curtailments" described in Goffman's work which are identified in the Farfield study are not remarked upon by the boys, whilst others are. Thus pupils tend to be uncritical of the faceless "authorities" which place them for unexplained reasons, in a residential school many miles from home. This is because that, as children, they are accustomed to such decisions being made on their behalf. The same applies to the allocation of key worker and class groups, junior and senior status. Where areas are concerned in which the pupils are used to exercising autonomy, their complaints are vocalized. Thus Alex, Ryan, Colin and Lewis

all complain of having less freedom at Farfield than they have at home, particularly in their movements during periods of free time, and yet they seem to be relatively accepting of the chaotic and inconsiderate referral arrangements. This is perhaps, indirectly, a positive outcome, in that a recognition of their objectified status upon being referred to Farfield would make most pupils' introductions to the school even more traumatic than they are already. The fact that, as children, they have expectations of this type of treatment in such circumstances, allows them to make a relatively speedy recovery from this first "curtailment of self".

Many pupils are sensitive to what Goffman describes as acts of "mortification". These are often taken for granted aspects of institutional life, which outside the institution might be regarded as affronts to personal dignity. Acts of mortification include acts of "personal defacement", such as the stripping of the inmate of personal possessions, and the provision of institutional clothing. These activities do occur in isolated cases at Farfield, but by and large pupils are encouraged to decorate their rooms with their own possessions (though particularly valuable or fragile items are sometimes placed under the guardianship of staff), as Ryan notes in his recollected first impressions of the school (see section 1). Violations which are described repeatedly take the form of physical contamination, enforced interpersonal contact, and the enactment of normally private functions in group situations. Boys complain of the smell of the house, the sharing of washing and toileting facilities, the embarrassment of communal showering and communal sleeping, and the feeling of being under almost constant staff supervision.

A further form of defilement is the way in which certain areas of the inmates' lives which are within the scope of the inmate's judgement outside of the institution, become the subject of "regimentation" and "tyrannization" within the institution. A particularly interesting example of this concerns the much criticized arrangements for smoking in the school. Pupils are restricted to a maximum number of cigarettes at designated times throughout the day, which must be consumed at the time of distribution and in a designated place. Infringements of these rules leads to punishments and the withdrawal of privileges, the most commonly cited of these being "having fags stopped". Another example of this defilement, is the restriction placed on the pupils' freedom of movement during non-school hours. Both of these defilements are of particular interest because they highlight the specific character of the residential school. For whilst in matters relating to the "house-life" of the boys, they suffer under a heavier weight of restriction than they often would in their family homes, in their school lives they are subject to fewer restrictions than they have experienced in mainstream state day schools. The topic of smoking is a case in point. Whereas in the mainstream school, smoking at break times is often covert and associated with the anti-school sub-culture (see Davies, 1984), at Farfield cigarettes are distributed by staff during school breaks, and the smoking of the cigarettes is supervised in an appointed place. Each pupil is entitled to a specified number of cigarettes per day, which are purchased for the children by the staff. In the matter of freedom of movement, during school time pupils can gain exemptions from classroom activities for a variety of non-educational purposes, such as helping in the kitchen or laundry, and there is also more access to teacher attention in the small classes at Farfield (maximum 6) than in most

mainstream schools, and greater opportunities for individualized study. On the "house-side" smoking and freedom of movement are activities which are always subject to staff approval. Cigarette quotas are the same at weekends as they are on school days; unsupervised trips into town are permitted only at certain times and subject to strict timing.

These acts of "curtailment" and "mortification" tend to be rationalized by the institutional authorities on the grounds of being to the ultimate benefit of the individual in contributing to a structured and well ordered environment. The boys in the present study tend to accept these restrictions for this reason, and because of the underlying belief that the school has an essentially benevolent purpose for them.

A further feature identified by Goffman is that of "echelon authority". That is, the situation whereby all inmates are subject to the authority of all staff at all times. This is a significant feature of Farfield (and all residential schools) in that it contrasts sharply with pupils' experience of other types of school, and is most remarked by those pupils who have come to Farfield directly from their family homes. Goffman suggests that echelon authority means that, for the inmates, the task of "staying out of trouble requires persistent conscious effort" (p.46). This does not seem to be borne out in the present study, due mainly, it is suggested, to the particular quality of staff-pupil relationships at Farfield. This is a point that will be taken up later.

This brings us to the "privilege system", which is defined by Goffman in terms of "the absence of deprivation" (p.53) and the provision

of things which would be taken for granted outside the institution. At Farfield, we find being given permission to make coffee in the school kitchen, sleeping in the smaller living unit of the flat, pocket money, late bedtimes and extra cigarettes cited as significant privileges. Privileges are granted at Farfield in accordance with junior or senior status, with additional privileges being granted to pupils who do "jobs". However, as Goffman suggests, pupils at Farfield (particularly Ryan) are more vocal about the consequences of not doing the principal's bidding, in relation to jobs, than they are about the rewards that such jobs bring. On the other hand, it is clear from what many pupils say, that the general material aspect of the school is of a quality which exceeds that which they have been accustomed to, both at home and in former institutions.

Ryan's view of the privilege system is extreme in the degree to which it is negative. Other pupils have more positive views. As we have seen, Ryan's view of the privilege system is characteristic of his attitude towards many of the formal aspects of life at Farfield, such as the treatment of junior boys and the role of the principal. Although he holds negative views about the doing of "jobs", and believes the rewards to be paltry, or even non-existent, he still outwardly conforms to these demands. This combination of behaviour and a contrary attitude represent what Goffman describes as the inmate's mode of "adaptation" to the institution. Goffman identifies four such modes:

1. situational withdrawal
2. the intransigent line
3. colonization

4. conversion

These modes are not necessarily discrete, in that inmates will often exhibit different modes of adaptation at different times and in different situations. Goffman also suggests that the modes of adaptation will often be combined with loyalty to the inmate group, which is an important feature in the Farfield sample. The present research finds no evidence of situational withdrawal, which describes "a drastic curtailment of involvement in interactional events" (p.61). There is only limited evidence of the overt hostility to the school regime, identified by Goffman as the intransigent line. Ryan's hostility is covert, though Mick's avowed refusal to co-operate with attempts to change his behaviour are closer to this form of adaptation. The two most prominent forms of adaptation in evidence among the boys are those of colonization and conversion. Colonization describes the situation where "the sampling of the outside world provided by the establishment is taken by the inmate as a whole, and a stable relatively contented existence is built up out of the maximum satisfactions procurable within the institutions" (p.62). This form of adaptation is particularly evident among pupils with a substantial history of residential provision, who become "immunized" against the deprivations which characterize total institutions. Greg and Brian both illustrate this form of adaptation, in their generally uncritical response to their surroundings. So does Colin, to a lesser extent, in his claim that "there are no rules" at Farfield, and his praise for the quality of school activities, such as "trips out". In these instances, Colin simply takes for granted the institutional aspects of these situations. The same is true of John, in his unqualified praise of the school for its material

comfort and the generosity of the principal, and his assertion that he would rather be at Fairfield than at home. Ryan, however, demonstrates a more subtle form of colonization, in the way in which he makes use of the structures available at Fairfield to maximize his personal satisfaction. Lewis, however, pursues a line of adaptation closer to that described as "conversion". This is where "the inmate appears to take over the official or staff view of himself and tries to act out the role of the perfect inmate" (p.63). The difference between the colonization and conversion modes of adaptation is neatly illustrated in the Fairfield study by the underlying tension which seems to exist between Ryan and Lewis. Their different forms of adaptation give them conflicting definitions of desirable forms of behaviour. A clear example of Lewis's degree of conversion is the way in which Lewis complains about Ryan's lack of respect for school rules, and his habit of "taking liberties", such as when he makes cups of coffee without staff permission. Ryan's actions here, of course, illustrate the colonization line of adaptation. On the other hand, Ryan criticizes Lewis's degree of conversion, when he complains of Lewis being "just so to Mr Talbot", and expresses dissatisfaction with the strict way in which Lewis supervises other boys during "jobs". Ryan declares that he will want to "have a laugh" when he is supervising other boys, in order to make the situation more pleasurable.

Lewis does not, however, represent the conversion mode wholly. The complexities of his position are illustrated through two incidents. Firstly, in his description of a situation which led to a conflict of loyalties between Mr Talbot and his fellow pupils: whilst Lewis complied superficially with the principal's instructions, he also showed his loyalty

to his peers. Secondly, Lewis is critical of staff treatment of Max, the bully. In this later instance, however, it might be argued that Lewis shows a greater commitment to the official "staff line" than do the staff themselves. Both of these incidents, illustrate the way in which loyalty to the inmate group takes precedence over adherence to the primary mode of adaptation. Ryan also, in his overtly caring attitude toward certain junior pupils shows how his selfless loyalty to the inmate group co-exists with the essentially self-centred colonization mode.

Ryan's form of colonization is coupled with subtle, understated intransigence and his attitude to Farfield in constantly underpinned by a sharp realization of the differences between life inside and life outside Farfield. Ryan's mode of adaptation, therefore, involves him in active manipulation of particular structures and situations. The more passive form of colonization, as identified in the modes of adaptation associated with "immunized" individuals such as Brian, Colin and Greg, is, according to Goffman, socially debilitating. This is because it is a mode of adaptation which ignores the world outside of the institution, and, therefore, is not easily transferable to a non-institutional environment. Greg illustrates this problem when he declares that there is "no difference" between Farfield and a "normal house", and that rules and restrictions imposed by the school are equally applicable to a family home. Greg, of course, has lived in a children's home for much of his life. For him, total institutions are the model for living with which he is most familiar. One of Greg's major concerns, however, relate to his realization that soon he must leave school and the children's home and learn to live

independently. He fears the helplessness of himself alone "in a little flat with nothing in it".

Unlike Greg, most of the children in the study, including those with long histories of residential care, expect when they leave school to return to their family homes. Once again, this draws attention to the particular status of children in relation to Goffman's work. The degree of dependence which may be engendered by institutional experience, may not have quite the same devastating effect on a child, who by virtue of his public status, is required to be dependent, as on an adult, particularly if the child is able to return to a family home in the interim period between leaving school and taking up a fully independent life. However, it must be stressed that these debilitating consequences are observed in those pupils with long histories of residential care, and are not evident in the pupils with shorter term experience. (This draws attention to those writers who see the need for residential care to be seen in terms of a continuum which includes day services, and acts as a supplement to family care rather than an alternative such as: Wagner, 1988; Potter, 1986; Davis, 1981.)

Evidence of what Goffman calls the "underlife" of the institution is present in the Fairfield study. "Underlife" refers to the unofficial norms and practices of the inmate world, which go on without official approval. Included in this are "secondary adjustments", which are the constant use of forbidden practices in order to obtain officially acceptable satisfactions, or the use of acceptable practices to obtain forbidden satisfactions. At Fairfield, pupils who wish to smoke at forbidden times have to smuggle cigarettes and matches into the school or

"chip" (extinguish) half smoked "legal" cigarettes, conceal them and find a secret place to smoke the remains. Lewis refers to this practice of "having a fag on the fire escape" that leads from the flat. This usually takes place after the other children have been sent to bed, and it is a ritual shared by the other "flat boys". This is an indirect consequence of the official privilege system, in that the privilege of having a bed in the flat removes boys to a relatively isolated part of the building, which enables them to move around after lights out without fear of detection by staff or other pupils. Similarly, the availability of kitchen facilities in the flat complex, although not officially available to the boys, permits the "flat boys" to make illicit drinks and meals. As Ryan points out, it is commonly held by pupils that the route to most privileges at Farfield is through gaining favour with the principal; this is also, then, the route to certain illicit pleasures. This is also true of particular "jobs". There are "shit jobs" (Ryan), such as supervising juniors in the showers, and desirable jobs, such as working in the laundry. The latter job is desirable because it can combine the legitimate purpose of laundering clothes, with the unofficial pleasure of getting out of classroom activities. Ryan is very clear, however, about the fact that those out of favour with the principal get only the "shit jobs".

It should be clear to the reader by now that some of the analytical concepts proposed by Goffman can give us insight into and a vocabulary to describe Farfield school. With the aid of Goffman we have been able to define some of the characteristics which such an institution can be seen to share with the total institutions of his study. There are, however, many aspects of the Farfield study which offer grounds for

departing from Goffman's analysis as a complete explanation of the way in which the school operates as a social system. We will now turn to a consideration of some of these aspects.

Goffman states that the fear that one's "physical integrity" is at risk is a common feeling among inmates of total institutions. Staff, he claims, have the power to inflict physical punishment, with or without official approval, by virtue of the custodian-inmate relationship, which places the inmate in a subordinate position to staff members. At Farfield there is no indication of such a fear in relation to staff treatment of boys, though Brian and Colin describe this as a feature of other institutions. There is, however, repeated reference to the practice of bullying by pupils of one another, and of "winding up", which is a form of verbal harassment. It is important to note here that only one bully is identified by name (Max). Far more common than descriptions of acts of terrorization by individuals, are claims by victims of bullying, of being bullied by generalized groups of other boys. Furthermore, many pupils who claim to be victims of bullying at Farfield, also claim to have been victims of bullying in other situations, prior to being pupils at Farfield. This is true of Alan, Mick, Brian, and John. This is not to say that the social organization of an institution, through its networks of power and authority, can have no bearing on the incidence of bullying, but rather that the evidence of the present study requires a different form of analysis. For this we turn to the work of Olweus (1984).

Olweus has reported research conducted in Sweden into bullying in schools. On the basis of this research Olweus identifies two types of

participant in the bullying process: "bullies" and "whipping boys". Bullies tend to be characterized by an "aggressive personality pattern" (p.67): they react aggressively in many situations, are uninhibited in their aggressive behaviour, over which they have poor control, and they view violence in a positive manner. "Whipping boys", on the other hand, tend to be anxious, insecure, unpopular, with low self-esteem, have a negative attitude towards themselves, and tend to be physically weaker than their peers. Most whipping boys tend to be passive, but a minority are described as "Provocative Whipping Boys". This latter group is characterized by a tendency to be actively irritating, tension creating and restless". It is of relevance to the present study to note the close similarity between the characteristics of Olweus's "bullies" and the characteristics of "conduct disordered" children (Rutter, 1975). The characteristics of the "provocative whipping boys" also are shared with conduct disordered children. The "passive whipping boys", however, are very close in character to children with what Rutter describes as "neurotic disorders". The importance of these observations to the present study is the notion that some children may well enter schools like Farfield with already established identities as "whipping boys", or even "provocative whipping boys", and that occurrences of bullying and "winding up", as described by some Farfield pupils, may be less a function of the school organization than a facet of the individual boy's make up which he brings into the school. This is made even more likely by the relatively high representation of conduct and neurotic disordered children (particularly the former) in the residential EBD school population (Laslett, 1977).

A further point of interest, in relation to bullying, is raised by Lewis's remarks about the most commonly named bully, Max. Lewis believes that Max is a bully and a generally aggressive person because he has been deprived of a stable family home, and the love and care which are expected to go with such an environment. Lewis describes what he believes to be the failure of the staff at Farfield to realize Max's problems. According to Lewis, the staff tended to respond to Max's bad behaviour only with punishments and reprimands. Lewis is convinced that Max needed to be shown that he was cared for, and to be sympathetically counselled about his aggression. Lewis says that "Max was known by the staff as a bully", and indicates that he was defined in no other terms. Here Lewis is showing a pupil's eye view of the labelling process (Rist, 1977; Hargreaves et al., 1975), whereby staff members' negative expectations of pupils, influence their behaviour towards pupils, which in turn leads the pupil to behave in negative ways, as a reaction to the negative treatment they receive from staff. Deviant behaviour which is a response to labelling is referred to as "secondary deviance" (Lemert, 1967). It is possible to view the personality types proposed by Olweus (1984) and Rutter (1975), in the light of this theory, and suggest that they owe their origins and perpetuation to the interpretive structures used by teachers and other professionals to classify behaviour. In the case of the bullies and whipping boys of the Farfield study, it would seem that the identities of the pupils are established prior to referral. The very referral of a child to a school like Farfield implies certain judgements relating to the boy's identity. These judgements are recorded in the documentation that accompanies the boys from one institution to another. Upon entry to Farfield pupils are assigned to certain categories (ie. class, key worker group, dormitory),

which we have seen to have important status implications for pupils, on the basis of this documentation. Once assigned to particular categories, pupils are accompanied by certain expectations which have implications for their quality of life at Farfield. Hargreave et al. (1975) describe the system of typing as having two preliminary stages: "speculation" (about the type that a pupil adheres to), and "elaboration" (in which evidence is sought in the pupil's behaviour to support the type designation selected at the speculation stage). Thus a child of senior age who for reasons of perceived "immaturity" (based on written records) is placed in the junior group (at the "speculation stage), is likely to be labelled a "cabbage" by the other boys; cabbage status carries with it expectations of poor social skills and academic weakness. Such an individual is unlikely to gain acceptance among boys of his own age, he will therefore tend to associate with junior boys or become an isolate: thus either confirming the original view of him as immature (ie. preferring the company of younger children), or raising questions as to his ability to integrate (ie. preferring not to associate with other boys). Thus the evidence collected in the "elaboration" stage whilst appearing to support the original speculation, is actually based on a response to the initial speculation. This is a hypothetical case, but all of the institutional features described are present in the Farfield system.

Whilst the dangers of labelling, which Lewis alerts us to, are present at Farfield, and may even result in failings of the type described by Lewis, it must also be noted that there is evidence to suggest that some pupils undergo a process of redefinition, whereby pupils claim to have developed more positive identities since being at the school. These claims

are made by Colin, Alex, Ryan, John, Jim and Ian in particular. These boys refer to their former, pre-Farfield selves often in negative terms, such as "bad", "like a wild dog", "mixed up", often having difficulty in relating to their families, and being involved in delinquent activities. Their experiences of Farfield, however, are often cited as having led to their development of new attitudes and behaviour, which have in turn led them to become calmer, less aggressive, more thoughtful; they get on better with their families, and prefer to avoid delinquent activities. These changes are often attributed to the respite they experience from home based problems, by being at Farfield, and, more importantly, the constructive, supportive and sympathetic attitudes of staff and pupils at Farfield, with whom they are able to share rewarding and profitable relationships.

It is in this key area of interpersonal relationships, particularly staff-pupil relationships, that the analysis of the Farfield study must depart from Goffman's theoretical model of the total institution. In Goffman's work a keystone of the total institution is the way in which staff view inmates as objects, as opposed to individuals, that are to be dealt with in an impersonal and mechanistic fashion, so as to facilitate the smooth running of the institution. Relationships between staff and inmates are purely functional and never personal, since personal relationships would hinder the machinery of the institution through the need to recognize individual needs. This characterization fails completely to capture the quality of the interpersonal relationships described by the pupils. It is argued that this aspect of Farfield school is best analyzed through reference to the work of some of the pioneer workers in this field,

and particularly to the commonly held notion among these writers that such schools should offer pupils personally liberating experiences.

It is a common feature of the writings of many such pioneer workers in this field that pupils in such schools are in need of freedom from various constraints which many of them have suffered in their former lives (see chapter 2, of this thesis). Neill (1962), at Summerhill, claims to have renounced "all discipline, all suggestion, all moral training, all religious instruction" (p.20), in the professed belief that children are "innately wise and realistic". Wills, (1941, 1945, 1960) in a more structured and formally disciplined setting, pioneered the use of "shared responsibility", whereby inmates of the institutions he ran were given a free reign to make their own arrangements within certain clearly defined areas. Shaw (1965) employed a similar, though even more formalized and specialized, system of pupil and staff committees, for the same purpose. Lyward was less in favour of the "imprisoning formalism" of structures for self-government; he believed that pupils in his care required respite from this as well as from the other constraints that had been imposed upon them in their former lives, and that had been responsible for robbing them of their spontaneity and zest for autonomous life (Burn, 1956). Central to Lyward's aim was to help the children in his care to regain their capacity for "spontaneity in human relationships" (p.237). One of the chief aims of these pioneers was to give their pupils a sense of self-worth. This was achieved by putting their pupils onto voyages of self-discovery, which involved encouraging pupils to deal with challenging situations in a supportive environment and with the use of psychoanalysis. Several pioneers (in particular, Wills, 1960; Neill, 1962; Bettelheim, 1955),

however, were to recognize that psychoanalysis was not an essential part of the therapeutic process, but that the environment itself could be the major therapeutic tool.

The environment includes, of course, the material surroundings as well as the people with whom individual children come into contact. The keynote of such an environment is that it should, in all its aspects, reinforce the view that each child is a valued and important individual, who is accepted as an autonomous person, with the rights and responsibilities which go with such autonomy, and be geared to promote the positive social, psychological and physical development of each pupil (Bettelheim, 1950). This leads us to a recognition of the importance of the Farfield pupils' response to their physical surroundings. Their perception of the high quality of material provision helped them to feel valued and cared for (cf. Bettelheim, 1950; Laslett, 1977; Rose, 1978; Wilson and Evans, 1980), and the positive and supportive relationships they shared with staff contributed to the development of more positive personal identities.

A sharper contrast with Goffman's view of relationships in a total institution would be hard to imagine. When comparing Farfield with their experience of former institutions, the boys give the impression that there are many aspects of Farfield life which give them a sense of liberation, not unlike that intended by the pioneer workers in this field. They find the staff more friendly, more tolerant, more helpful. They claim that the staff show greater interest in the pupils' personal lives and states of mind, and that they give pupils a greater degree of individual

attention. Some pupils also find the smaller class sizes beneficial for many of the same reasons. They also find the individualized school work generally more appropriate to their personal needs.

Of particular significance to many of these pupils is their new found ability to enjoy positive, valuable and valued relationships with adults at the school. In making this claim many pupils draw attention to what have been particularly poor quality relationships with teachers in mainstream schools, and in so doing echo some of the writings that exist on this subject (see chapter 1, section iiib, of this thesis). They complain of being treated with disrespect by their mainstream teachers, (cf. Tattum, 1982), of their teachers being humourless (Woods, 1984). It is also claimed that certain acts of misbehaviour can be justified in terms of a tit-for-tat situation, which bears strong echoes of Rosser and Harré's (1976) notions of "reciprocity" and "equilibration". These concepts explain the way in which classroom misbehaviour can often be seen as "secondary deviance", that is a like response to a punitive act, which itself is not recognized as legitimate by the pupil. This draws attention to the notion proposed by Gillham (1984), that many persistent learning and behavioural difficulties in schools can be attributed to the "failure of relationships, instructional and personal" (p.159), and that the most effective remedies for these failures require a flexibility of approach, by the school system and individual teachers, to the individual, social and educational needs of pupils. A view supported by research which shows that disturbed pupils place staff in high regard who exhibit qualities of friendliness, flexibility, tolerance and sympathy (Carnell, 1983; Dawson,

1984 and 1985). We will now turn to an exploration of some of the organizational features of Farfield.

In delineating the institutional causes of pupil disaffection from comprehensive schools, Tattum (1982) draws on Max Weber's model of bureaucracy. Weber describes the main characteristics of bureaucratic organizations, as follow:

1. a hierarchic structure
2. regulation of organization through written rules
3. possibility of appeal from lower to higher office against decisions
4. impersonal nature of authority, in that it rests in the office and not the person
5. members of the administration are separate from the owners of the means of production
6. the organization provides a life long pensionable job.

A central feature of bureaucracies is that they carry out their functions in an impersonal manner, and they are governed by rationality and objectivity. Because roles within the hierarchy are rationally and objectively defined there is consensus in acceptance of authority throughout the organization. However, one of the major dysfunctions of bureaucracy is the consequence of a failure of goal consensus, which is made manifest by the development of sub-cultures within the organization (cf. Hargreaves, 1967), each of which will have its own goals, which are different and often in conflict with those of the main organization. This also leads to failures in the normal system of power relations, with their reliance on rationality and objectivity, and the need to enforce official

goals through the use of coercive authority. This situation is further exacerbated when, as Tattum suggests, rules are applied selectively without regard for the dignity of subordinates, and without rational explanation. The outcome of this state of affairs in schools is a deterioration in staff pupil relationships. In short, the principles of bureaucracy, with their dependence upon the impersonal administration of rules, conflict with the unavoidably personal nature of classroom relationships. There is a growing body of literature which suggests that high levels of pupil disaffection in schools can be related to a strong reliance on the exercise of impersonal authority, through reference to rules. The "disaffection prone school" (Reynolds, 1984) has been defined as one characterized by a highly coercive regime, which emphasises punishment, rather than individual treatment of deviants. Other writers have shown that pupils become disaffected from school when they believe that they are not treated as individuals by their teachers, and when signs of individuality are condemned as deviance (Schostak, 1983; Cronk, 1987).

Other writers have suggested that modern schools are organized to suit an "ideal pupil" (Schostak, 1983; Silberman, 1970). This pupil is docile passive, and accepts the teacher's authority unquestioningly. Apple (1980) and Harris (1979), argue that the school curriculum is best seen as an agency of social control, with both the forms of knowledge and methods of delivery being calculated to induce docility and passivity in learners, and so prepare them for passive involvement in the capitalist society. Whilst the political analysis accompanying these views is hotly debated, there are other writers who accept the observations underlying this standpoint. They argue, often from a social-psychology standpoint, that

less effective learning takes place in formal teacher-as-transmitter, pupil-as-receiver classrooms, than in classrooms where teachers and pupils work collaboratively (Rogers, 1978; Barnes, 1976). Furthermore, other writers, concerned with the organizational correlates of disaffection have argued that schools which allow pupils an active rather than passive role in the organization, by offering pupils organizational responsibilities, and which employ therapeutic responses to disaffection, are more successful in limiting and preventing disaffection than schools which reduce pupils to a more passive status (Reynolds, 1979; Rutter et al, 1979). Recently, attention has been drawn to the influence which the quality of interpersonal relations between staff and pupils, can have on pupil motivation and behaviour (Cronk, 1987).

The Farfield boys express a sense of relief at the respite that the school provides for them from their mainstream schools, and particularly poor relationships with teachers. (Mortimore (1983) found a similar sense of respite among pupils referred to support centres.) They also welcome the experience of respite from the pressures of delinquent peers and unsatisfactory family relationships. In keeping with Lambert's (1975) findings, based on a study of pupils in non-specialist boarding schools, pupils at Farfield find the experience of being away from home makes them more appreciative of their home backgrounds, and helps them to develop ideas and attitudes geared towards improving home relationships. There is some limited evidence that the parents of the present sample believe that referral to Farfield has led to genuine improvements in their sons' behaviour at home and in their manner of relating to their parents and siblings (see appendix V).

On the face of it, an organizational explanation for the positive effects of the Farfield regime seem unlikely. Superficially at least, there would appear to me as many similarities between the organizational structure of Farfield and Tattum's view of the comprehensive school, as there are between Farfield and many of the pioneer EBD residential schools. Farfield is most clearly a rule governed establishment. There is a formal hierarchic structure with the principal at the top. The principal is perceived to be the sole rule maker. Pupils claim to have no formal involvement in the rule making process. Schooling is compulsory, and teaching is conducted to a relatively formal timetable. However, there are certain key differences here also. Because of the principal's key role as rule maker, the authority exercised by him is not impersonal. Also, as a part owner of the school (many pupils believe him to be the sole owner), the principal's relationship to the rest of the administration (ie. the staff) is made more distant than it might otherwise be. It is suggested that these factors contribute to a humanizing of the organizational structure of the school, by dissociating, in the pupils' minds, the restrictive rule-based aspects of the school from what they feel to be the central function of the school, that is the therapeutic treatment of pupils. It is interesting to note that notions of power and authority are almost exclusively related to the role of the principal by the pupils, whilst the rest of the staff are portrayed in the role of care givers. This would also seem to have the effect of creating considerable consensus among the pupils as to the goals of the school. This latter observation is further supported by what we know of the informal pupil culture. There would appear to be a close correspondence between the goals of the pupil

culture, and those of the official regime (as perceived by the pupils), namely the therapeutic treatment of pupils. This is further emphasized by the position of Lewis, who has both high status in the official culture and in the informal pupil culture.

In following Tattum's line in applying a functionalist organizational theory, to illuminate the formal mechanisms at work, it is suggested that the Human Relations model (Perrow, 1979; Handy, 1981) offers interesting possibilities. This model stresses the compatibility between the goals and values of the individual with those of the organization. The basis for this model is the notion that if the high morale of subordinates in an organization is incorporated in the goal structure of the organization, then subordinates will exercise a greater willingness to work toward the organization's goals. Good leadership, in such an organization, is defined in terms of good social relations between superordinates and subordinates. One of the often quoted research studies in support of this view is that by Lewin et al. (1939), and is of particular interest to the present study, because it involves the organizational behaviour of children. They found that children performed more co-operatively and with less aggression, in a social climate characterized by a democratic form of leadership, as opposed to autocratic or laissez faire forms of leadership. Democratic leadership stresses consultation with all group members as to approaches to group tasks, whereas autocratic and laissez faire approaches disregard the personal thoughts of participants. This conclusion is borne out by much of the research on schools cited above and in the introductory chapter of the present work (eg. Tattum, 1982; Schostak, 1983; Reynolds, 1979; Rutter et al., 1979; Cronk, 1987), which shows that disaffection

among secondary school pupils is often associated with autocratic regimes and poor interpersonal relationships between pupils and staff, and that schools and teachers who incorporate pupil consultation into everyday classroom/school life and place a high value on pupil individuality, are more successful in limiting pupil disaffection and optimizing pupil compliance. (The relationships between compliance structures and the goals of an organization have been explored by Etzioni (1975), and this work is applied to the two fieldwork schools in chapter 8 of this thesis in greater detail than is appropriate in the present section.)

Thus, whilst Mr Talbot, principal of Farfield, is seen as an autocrat, he is seen, by the pupils, to be at the head of an organization which serves their personal interests in very significant ways. Furthermore, the day to day contact which pupils have with their individual key workers and teachers is viewed not so much in terms of a power or authority relationship, as a personal relationship, directed towards the individual needs of each child, and involving consultation and interchange at a very personal level, and giving the pupils a sense of authority over their own lives. Thus, whilst Farfield cannot be said to be organized strictly along democratic lines, it is argued that the pupils experience the same personal benefits that such an organizational structure would provide, in terms of significant involvement in decision making about issues of personal importance (a theme emphasised by many of the pioneer workers discussed above). The sense of personal value which results from this is reflected in the informal pupil culture, where a high regard for pupils' social and emotional needs is displayed. This view of the

therapeutic nature of relationships with staff is, it has been argued, aided by the focusing of power in the person of the principal.

This section has applied certain analytical concepts to the study of Farfield school. Areas of particular interest have been identified and analyzed in order to place this school in the context of a broader understanding of education. This analysis has been presented separately and before the study of the second fieldwork institution, firstly, in an attempt to display something of the individual character of the school, and secondly, to provide us with certain clear analytical pointers to significant areas in the second school. This has not been an exhaustive analysis, and many of the points so far raised, and some which have not, will be developed in the sections which follow the Lakeside study. It is to this study that we now turn.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE LAKESIDE STUDY

Lakeside school is a non-maintained school providing residential care and education for up to 40 boys of secondary school age. All the pupils are funded by LEA's. The school was founded in the late 1940's and is administered as a charitable trust. At one period in its relatively long history, the school provided 52 week per year provision for some of its pupils, some of whom were girls. The majority of its history, however, it has taken only boys, and in recent years has offered only term time provision. Throughout its history the school has been associated with therapeutic approaches to the treatment of children with emotional and behavioural difficulties.

The school is situated on the outskirts of a small rural village, approximately 5 miles from the nearest town, and within 10 miles of the nearest city. The school occupies a site of approximately 20 acres, a substantial proportion of which is wooded, and contains a full sized football pitch. The main building on the site is a large 19th century stone built mansion, with deep set windows which admit insufficient light to the building; the ground floor rooms in particular. Housed here are: a windowless vestibule, reached via a recently constructed security door, the school office, the head master's office, the school kitchen, main dining room, a pupils' sitting/ T.V. room, pupils' bathrooms and showers, the

staffroom, boys' and staff bedrooms. The head master is resident at Lakeside, occupying, with his family, a second floor flat. The care staff are also resident, and the majority of these occupy rooms on the top (3rd floor) floor of the house. The married care staff occupy bungalows, which are also in the school grounds, but at some remove from the main building. A separate building, situated on the other side of a small concrete area, close to the main building, is known as "the annexe". On the ground floor of the annexe are two art and craft workshops, and upstairs there is self-contained accommodation for senior pupils consisting of: a sitting room/kitchen, bedrooms and a bathroom. Approximately 150 yards from this main residential complex stands the teaching block. This is at a lower ground level than the residential buildings, and is reached via a winding downhill concrete path. The teaching block represents a considerable contrast to the main building, in that it is a two storey building of wooden prefabricated construction, of a type commonly erected in the 1960's and 70's. It has many large windows, thus making its 5 classrooms bright and airy. The building also contains a stockroom and the deputy head master's office. A short distance beyond the teaching block are the staff bungalows mentioned above. Other smaller buildings on the site include sheds designated for craft work, and the "club hut". The club hut is a wooden nissen hut, containing a pool table, dart board and table tennis table. The hut has been decorated by the boys with murals and oddments of wall paper. Like the rest of the school buildings, this room has an air of disrepair about it.

The interior of the main house and the annexe are in a variable state of repair, with evidence of repair work in progress at various

points. The boys' bedrooms are the most attractively decorated part of the house. Each bedroom is decorated differently, in accordance with the wishes of the boys using the rooms. The walls are also liberally adorned with posters and other personal items belonging to the boys. Furnishing is sparse. In spite of signs of disrepair, the house and annexe are kept scrupulously clean. The overall impression gained by the casual visitor to the school, however, would be of the sparseness and age of the fittings, and of the delapidated furniture and decor, which is most noticable in the classrooms and annexe accommodation area.

Much of the maintenance work around the school is carried out by the staff and pupils. A brief tour of the school, however, reveals this to be a mamouth task owing to the size and age of the school complex. However, staff and pupils are proud to point out to visitors examples of their handiwork, such as the extensive network of concrete paths and walls that link various parts of the school.

There are 7 full time teachers, including the head master and his deputy. The head master combines his role of head of education with overall charge for the school. He has no timetabled teaching periods. The deputy head master has a reduced teaching commitment. There are 8 full-time child care workers, including the head of care. There is also a school matron. There is a school secretary and 7 ancilliary workers, which include kitchen and cleaning staff. In addition to their teaching duties, teachers work an average of 15 hours per week "extraneous duties", for which they are paid an additional allowance.

The study was conducted over a 3 month period , between January 16th and April 15th 1986. At the time of the study there were 32 pupils on roll at the Lakeside. The age range (calculated on 16th January, 1986) being 10 and 18 years (mean: 14.4; mode: 15; median: 14.6). The age of Lakeside pupils tends, then, to be one year in advance of the Farfield pupils. Similarly, length of stay of Lakeside boys is longer than that of Farfield boys. The 6 longest serving boys at Lakeside have been there for between 4 and 6½ years; the average length of stay is 2.8 years.

At the time of the study no written account of the school's aims and policies was available. This information, therefore, was gleaned from interviews with the head master. One of the reasons for this state of affairs is the fact that at the time of the study the head master had only recently taken up the post, after the previous incumbent's retirement. The previous head had been in post for many years and the change of head master was not a smoothe transition; this point will be taken up later. For these reasons the policies of the school were very much in a state of flux.

The head master, Donald, described the aim of the school as to provide pupils with "severe behaviour difficulties", who fall within the normal ability range, with opportunities for "positive growth and development". The school operates, according to Donald, through a "holistic approach", which demands that each child be seen as a whole, and not simply in terms of his "problems". The aim is to prepare such pupils for, at least, "personal survival", and, hopefully, constructive, independent involvement in the wider society.

Donald believes that these aims could be thwarted by some of the undesirable consequences of institutional life, and he makes repeated use of the term "institutionalization". For him a key aspect of institutionalization is the tendency of the institution to rob individuals of the will and ability for self-determination and independence. Consequently, he claims, pupils at Lakeside are encouraged to have maximum involvement in the life of the school. They are encouraged to see themselves, alongside staff, as members of a community, which they can help to shape in accordance with their own needs. The word "contribution" crops up frequently as a central concept in the school's approach to the "treatment" of pupils. Pupils are not only involved in decision making in the school, they are also involved in the physical maintenance of the school. This provides them with practical skills, and also, in Donald's view, helps to promote in them a sense of their own "dignity", because they have the knowledge that they have a positive and tangible "contribution" to their living environment. Donald also, however, candidly admits to this contribution to the maintenance of the school being of practical importance to a school with financial difficulties.

A central means of motivation for children, after an initial period of assessment, is to encourage pupils in activities at which they can achieve success. This, claims Donald, helps them to build the necessary confidence to tackle more challenging situations. He describes a major aim of the school as being to help pupils overcome fears of failure, and to promote their willingness to confront personally challenging situations.

Donald describes his approach as theoretically "eclectic"; making use of behaviour modification techniques, such as reward systems, as well as therapeutic counselling and the encouragement of "acting out" of problematic behaviour. A strong emphasis is also placed on the quality of the interpersonal relationships which exist between staff and pupils. He places a high value on staff members' ability to show empathetic skills, as well as their ability to present desirable models for behaviour and attitudes.

A strongly held belief, stressed repeatedly, is that the school should not usurp the role of the pupils' families. The school provides education and care, and as such, "provides a service" to the family as well as the child. This means that importance is attached to the efforts which are made to maintain close links with the school and the pupils' families. Failure to maintain such links, says Donald, can contribute to institutionalization.

It must be stressed that these aims are those formulated by the head master. He freely admits that the school is still developing towards the stage where these aims will be most satisfactorily fulfilled. A major barrier to the fulfilment of these aims is claimed to be the legacy left by the former head master. Donald has been in post for only 18 months, and claims to have received almost universal resistance from the staff and pupils to his attempts to "deinstitutionalize" the school.

The most striking contrast, initially, between the Lakeside and Farfield, is the relative largeness of the former, and the seemingly

endless complex of buildings and pathways! Like Farfield, however, Lakeside seems to exist in an atmosphere of peaceful tranquility, much of the time. At break times and in the evenings pupils have a relatively free range of the grounds, though in wet weather certain areas are declared out of bounds. Smoking is permitted among pupils at allotted times in a shed, which is close to the main building.

Pupils begin each day at Lakeside with "unit meetings". The term "unit" refers to "living unit". There are 2 such units in the school: one in the main house, where the majority of boys sleep, the other is in the annexe, where some senior boys sleep. During these meetings boys sit on comfortable chairs in a forum setting; discussion was observed to be free and open, with many boys contributing, and concentrating on relatively prosaic matters such as maintenance schedules and organizational matters (though none the less important for this). After these meetings all pupils attend an assembly of the whole school in the main sitting room. Once again, pupils are seated on comfortable chairs in a forum setting, and whilst pupils were observed to contribute, these meetings tended to have more of the atmosphere of a traditional school "assembly", which was conducted by the head master, or other of the senior staff. These meetings are used to discuss matters of general interest and often involve discussion of maintenance requirements and the allocation of maintenance tasks. Between 9.45 and 4 pm on weekdays there is school. In the evenings and at weekends there are, as at Farfield, "activities". Lakeside pupils seem to make greater use of outside facilities, than pupils at Farfield, by going out into the local town to snooker, boating and youth clubs. As at Farfield, pupils enjoy between 3 and 5 hours "free time" each day, when

they can play games or pursue personal interests in and around the school. Junior bed time is 8.30, and 10.30 for seniors.

A particularly distinctive feature of Lakeside school is "the Helpers' List". This is a list of pupils, compiled weekly, who are perceived to have performed conspicuously well, in academic or behavioural terms. Pupils are nominated by teachers, care and ancilliary staff. "Helpers" are entitled to additional privileges (later bed times, additional pocket money, and special recreational trips and visits known as the "helpers' treat"). Five or 6 pupils are normally placed on this list, with a further 5 or 6 being designated on a second list as "worthy of praise". This second list carried no particular additional privileges. Formal written assessments are far less in evidence at Lakeside than at Farfield.

Whilst at Farfield "jobs" are very closely linked with the privilege system, carrying additional rewards, at Lakeside all pupils are assigned jobs, including routine maintenance and general care taking. Additional jobs, such as washing up, are given as punishments. It is also an important feature of Lakeside that staff as well as pupils are allocated maintenance tasks. The same rota is posted on the staffroom door and the pupils' notice board, giving details of the assigned jobs. Pupils and staff were observed working side by side on tasks, such as painting, window replacement and gardening activities.

Lessons at Lakeside take place between 9.15 and 4.00 p.m. on weekdays. The curriculum is far more limited than that offered at

Farfield. In addition to English, maths. and P.E., all Lakeside pupils study: art, computer studies, history and life skills. Older pupils attend a local technical college, where they study vocational subjects and work towards City and Guilds examinations. The classroom atmosphere at Lakeside was observed to be similar to that of Farfield, with pupils expected to adopt relatively tarditional modes of classroom behaviour. There was an air of quiet and calm during lessons, with pupils addressing staff freely but with conventional respect, and spending much of their time seated. In contrast to Farfield, Lakeside pupils were permitted and encouraged to refer to staff by their christian names

The writer followed the same interview procedure at Lakeside as at Farfield. Nine boys were interviewed, though 4 boys were interviewed in a group situation and 5 on a one to one basis. All interviewees were from the senior group. Their ages were between 15 and 17. Interviews lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. All of the interviews took place within normal school hours.

Whilst the interviews were designed to allow for open ended and free responses from the pupils, the interviewer was also aware of the categories which had emerged from the Farfield interviews. As a result, there is a tendency for the Lakeside interviews to be similarly structured, and the data has been presented to reflect this.

ACCOUNT OF THE INTERVIEWS WITH PUPILS AT LAKESIDE SCHOOL

1. *The Pupils' Overall Impressions of the School, Including Their Recollections of Their First Experiences of the School*

The Lakeside boys recalled their initial experiences of the school with clarity and vividity, as did the Farfield boys. The range of initial reactions is extremely wide; ranging, literally, between "love" and "hate"! Larry is 15, and he has been at the school for 2½ years. He says, "I love it here!", and describes his early impressions in terms of excitement at the newness and unpredictability of life at the school. An excitement not altogether free of fear:

I was enjoying it [when I first came to Lakeside]. It was O.K. because it was different to what I was used to. It was a different way of life to what I used to lead. When I was living with my parents it was sort of posher than this. I'd never seen a bowl go flying across a room, or somebody having a big argument with a member of staff or something [...] Sometimes it was a bit frightening.

Larry makes it clear that the fear he felt soon subsided, and that its initial source actually became an attraction:

I wanted to stay because I enjoyed the type of activity that went on. I liked to get involved in the danger, y'know. It got my adrenalin going.

Later Larry clarifies "the type of thing that went on". This account involves a boy, Archibald, who is referred to repeatedly by many of the boys as a particularly active bully, who has since left the school:

There was a black kid here once. His name was Archibald. No-one liked him very much around the school. There was another kid, called Smith; he was a pretty rough sort of kid from Birmingham. And they started arguing once, one day. One was at one end of the dining room; one was at the other. And the next thing you know, he told Archibald, who was in charge of tea at that point, to shut up. And the next thing you know, you see a knife go flying over the top of your head! Then a bowl! Then tables! And them just diving at each other! And about five members of staff came in to stop it. It just ended up in a big fight!

This sort of thing, says Larry, "didn't happen very often. A couple of times a month. Something like that."(!)

This vignette of one of the more dramatic episodes in the history of Lakeside school, is not typical of the events recalled, but it is significant in that it represents one of the lasting impressions which the school has made on a 12 year old boy, whose previous schools had been a fee paying residential preparatory school, and a middle class, suburban comprehensive school. Larry freely admits that his "posh" middle class home had been by no means a haven of tranquillity. Far from it. He had seen his parents' marriage dissolve amid much acrimony, and claims that he was the victim of much "hitting around", by his father after his re-marriage. He claims that it was fear of his father that led him to run away from home. And that after the treatment he had received at the hands of his father, nothing he experienced at Lakeside rivalled the fear that

led to his running away. On the contrary, Lakeside was soon seen by Larry as a refuge:

[...] it was the atmosphere at home that really made me uneasy and nervous all the time. When I got here I could relax a bit, but not as much as I thought I could. I thought I'd be able to relax and enjoy myself. I can a bit, but not as much as I'd like to.

Elsewhere Larry refers to the fact that it was not until he had been at the school for a year that he finally "had the guts" to run away from home:

I don't think I'd have had the guts to do it, if I'd been living at home. I'm still glad I did it.

Larry admits that his response to the problems and fears of his home life was to run away. And although Lakeside, he believes, still presents him with certain "dangers", these are difficulties with which he can cope.

Jock is another boy who claims to enjoy life at Lakeside:

Some kids love being at home. I can't stand it. I get on alright with the rest of my family, but not my dad [...] I'm always glad to get back [to Lakeside].

Jock, at 17, is the oldest boy in the school, as well as one of its longest serving pupils. He has spent all but 2 months of his entire secondary school career at the school. He recalls his first day vividly, even though it happened 6 years previously. Like Larry, Jock's initial feelings were tinged with fear. On his first day he was chased by some of the other pupils, who, he claims, took one look at him and said, "let's get him!" He ran off, naturally enough. Now, however, in the light of his experience of

the school he reflects on the fact that that these boys may have meant something quite different from what he believed at the time. His initial fears were soon allayed and replaced by a sense of comfort and security which was provided, initially, by senior boys at the school. Jock describes the "system" by which he was adopted, in his early days at the school, by a senior boy. It was this senior boy's duty to guide him through his first few months at Lakeside. According to Jock, "the system" was a matter strictly between the boys themselves:

[...] this was between the boys only. They had a system. It weren't a staff idea. They didn't know nothing about it.

The older boys showed their charges, "what things you can't do and what things you can do. He'd help you out of trouble." Jock is adamant that the older boys "weren't bullies, they looked after them [ie. the younger boys]". Jock tells the following story to support his point:

We [11 year old Jock and another junior boy] were messing around in a room, and running through the house. And Dave Turner - one of the bigger lads here - stopped us and said: "you're gonna get told off and get a job, if you don't stop." As I walked away, the deputy head walked around the corner! So that sort of thing. They stopped you before they [the staff] got to you.

Jock also points out that "it was much stricter then than it is now". This observation is echoed by several other boys (6/9), and always with a measure of criticism.

Not all of the boys had such positive initial reactions to the school. Stan, a 15 year old boy who has been at the school for 17 months,

"hated it" at first. He admits that prior to attending Lakeside he had been a persistent truant and the victim of bullying at school (a mainstream comprehensive), and a boy who did not find it easy to make friends. He was initially given a conducted tour of Lakeside, by the notorious Archibald:

He just told me all the good things about the place. He didn't tell me any of the bad things.

After Stan's mother left him at the gate, on the first day, he at first refused to return into the school grounds:

I spent an hour down at the bottom of the drive talking to Gladys [a teacher at Lakeside].

She eventually coaxed him inside. He claims that, "after a month I settled down. I used to get on well with the old head master."

Stan's initial experiences of Lakeside caused him great distress, however. He claims that he was bullied in his early days, and on one occasion was injured when a boy threw a spoon at him. This last incident was a final straw for him. He ran away from the school; only to be brought straight back by his mother. When speaking of his current experience of the school, Stan speaks with pleasure of the fun he has mixing with the other boys at the school, and claims that he misses their company when he is at home during the holidays. He states that he now finds it easier to be sociable than he did before coming to the school.

Another boy whose initial reaction to the school was adverse is 15 year old Aurthur, who casts his mind back 3 years to recall, with disgust:

When I first come here, I couldn't stand it! I came up the front drive, put my bags in the sewing room, went to my bedroom, got changed. The next minute I had to do work and everything! Sweeping! Jobs!

He now views this initial experience differently:

Then I just got used to it. And it's worth it [...] It just comes natural. So that when you leave school you just think, "Oh, work - it's just natural!"

He sums up his overall feelings like this:

It's just a great place to live! You know where you stand. You know what's going to happen to you if you do something wrong. You know what's going to happen if you do something right.

This sense of security at "knowing where you stand" is mentioned by several boys as a positive aspect of Lakeside (5/9).

Only one boy claimed to have changed his view of Lakeside from an initially positive view to a negative one. This was Tom, a 15 year old, who has been at the school for 12 months:

[at first] I thought it was good. It looked like a good place. A good atmosphere [...], the kids were happy.

[But]

It's quite rubbish in most ways now. I hate where it is. It's too spaced out from places. I can't stand the countryside. You can't do much. You have to go to bed at half-nine! That's really rubbish. [...] We get videos; they're quite rubbish videos, considering. They wouldn't let us have horror movies and that, 'cos they make out we're disturbed and that! [laughs]

That's a load of crap! The whole thing is rubbish. Activities are rubbish, 'cos you have to do activities on a night.

[Tom]

Tom's selection of adjectives may be limited, but he gets his point across. An interesting point here is that whilst most of Tom's criticisms are echoed by the other boys, they are not seen as reasons for a damning condemnation of the school, as they are to Tom. In fact Tom's is a lone voice of discontent among the interviewees, eight out of nine of whom express positive attitudes towards the school.

2. The pupils' Degree of Satisfaction with the School

As has been noted, the boys of Lakeside, in general, expressed very positive feelings towards the school. The level of satisfaction indicated in the interviews could not be said to be absolute, however. All of the boys interviewed gave the impression that changes of immense significance had occurred in the school in the 18 months prior to the interviews. These changes were attributed, unanimously, to the effects of the retirement of the former head master, who had been in post for some 20 years, and the subsequent arrival of the new head master. Not only had the former head master left, however, but the majority of the staff who had worked under him had left also, leaving only 2 teachers and the matron, but

no members of the former care team. These changes clearly have a profound effect on the boys.

For the vast majority of the interviewees (7/9) these changes had been, and still are a source of dissatisfaction. A commonly repeated complaint (6/9) is that the new head master has replaced the old privilege system with a new and, the boys believe, an inferior one. Under the former head, certain boys had been designated "Senior Leaders" or "Junior Leaders". These positions carried with them both significant responsibilities as well as, to the pupils, significant rewards, both in material and status terms. Under the new head master "Leaders" are replaced by "Helpers" and pupils who are "Worthy of Praise", and the rights and rewards that go with such status have, in many pupils' eyes, been severely diminished. Jock sums up the significance of being a "Leader" as opposed to a mere "Helper":

[...] if you weren't a Leader you were nothing [...] You'd fight to get on the Leaders' list. Now you don't need a Helpers' list to do as much as you do. For instance, if you wanted to go into town, in them days, you had to be a Leader; now you don't have to be. If a Helper wants to take you, you go with him. Everyone gets more privileges. [Jock]

Surprisingly, the commonly acknowledged fact that "everyone gets more privileges", under the new system, is held to be of less significance than the fact that the official privilege system now has less to offer. Many boys claim that they would rather risk being "nothing" for the chance to gain privileges that are now the taken-for-granted right of all pupils. It is also of importance that under the old system, privileges were not easily won:

I was a Senior Leader. I had a lot of responsibility over quite a few things. Like, if a member of staff wasn't there, then you were the member of staff. You used to get special privileges. You had to be excellent to get there, in your manner, in your way of doing things. Your attitudes towards life, I suppose [...] If you were coping well [with school work] and doing your best in all areas, then you got on [the Leaders' List] [...] If you weren't on the list, you went to bed at half-eight. But if you was on the list you'd get later bed time. You could go for a walk down the village, or go to town on your own. [Jock]

It is, however, Larry's reference to the Leaders' role as a substitute member of staff, which pinpoints the central difference between a Leader and a Helper, and this is a matter of status, and possibly power. The actual differences in terms of privileges seems to be negligible, as 16 year old Fred informs us: "everyone went to bed at 8.30; Leaders went to bed at 10.30." The bed time for Helpers is still 10.30, but senior boys who are not on the Helpers' list go to bed at 10.00 pm. It is this levelling-up process which seems to be at the heart of much of the dissatisfaction:

All you get now is an extra 50p [pocket money] and half an hour extra bed time. But it's not the money, it's the status! [Jock]

The lack of status has clearly for some pupils taken away the motivation to achieve a place on the Helpers' list. As Stan states:

The Helpers' list. I've been on it quite a bit, but I'm not bothering anymore. You get 50p extra pocket money a week; you stay up half an hour extra. But you just get treated the same as normal kids. Other kids don't treat you with any respect. Like when you was in the Leaders' List, you used to get treated with respect. There wasn't so much cheeking, fighting or anything like that. [Stan]

Stan claims that Leaders had the right to "give jobs out, if there was any trouble", and, as a result, "hardly anything got broken then. Now there are lots of breakages." Frank provides more detail on the duties and role of the Leader, and the status this commanded:

We've got no status now. Before like, we was in charge of a bedroom; in charge of a table with 4 other kids on it. Jobs at night. Now you've got nothing. No-one is in charge of bedrooms. Staff are in at all the meals. No status at all. You had to work hard to get privileges. Junior Leaders took tables, got trips into town. Senior Leaders took trips into town, and they took tea. The staff stayed in the staffroom and ate their tea there.

It is difficult to unravel the difference between responsibility and privilege here. Clearly the responsibilities awarded to Leaders were seen in themselves as privileges. It is quite clear that Leaders exercised considerable authority over their fellow pupils. The role of Helper is merely a privilege without responsibility or status, and, therefore, is seen as worthless.

It is also commonly stated that the Leaders system did have its darker side. Larry describes why he thinks the new head changed the privilege system:

They [the staff] didn't think it was a good system because of all the bullying that went on. I wasn't a bully. I was one of the ones that was getting bullied, 'cos I was younger then. [Larry]

Many boys support this observation (6/9), but that is not to say that they see this as a justification for the dismantling of the Leaders' system, as Larry goes on to say:

But you all grew up through that stage. You came when you were young; you grew up through bullying, and then they went through it, and so on [...] I don't know if you call it bullying [...] It's just a word that the staff use. Sometimes it was bullying. There was a black kid who did most of the bullying, Archibald. He used to hit John Jones, who's only 13 but so thick in the head that he doesn't know what's happening to him. [Larry]

Having given this example of what he perceives to be bullying, Frank goes on to give an example of behaviour that, he believes, the staff wrongly interpret as bullying:

In the old days, you'd be punished for swearing at a senior boy. Now we get into trouble for hitting them [junior boys] for cheek. [Frank]

Frank and Tim also give an example of what they define as serious bullying, when they describe the way in which Archibald "used to blackmail kids". They describe an incident in which Archibald slashed both of them on the arms with a knife. They admit that they were too frightened to report this incident to staff, because of Archibald's influential position within the school, which meant that he was almost continuously on the Leaders' list. This observation is supported by Jock, who claims to have informed the former head master of the slashing incident, but says that "nothing was done about it".

The common belief among the boys is that the Leaders system, in spite of the drawbacks outlined above, made a significant contribution to the quality of life within the school, and that its abolition has led to a deterioration in behavioural standards among the boys. To support this, pupils refer to increases in levels of vandalism in the school, as well as an increase in disorderly behaviour among the younger boys in the school.

There is a strong feeling that the school is a less orderly place now than was under the former head master, and the change in the privilege system is seen to be a significant contributory factor in this deterioration.

Jock also describes the way in which, in his opinion, the quality of life at the school has been changed as a result of staffing changes and the accompanying "new system":

The way it used to be, if you messed around, the staff would hit you [...] Now they've had new staff, they've stopped that. They've gone soft. They don't hit you. If you swear at them they say, "don't use that language to me!" And that's it! In the old days it would have been all hell let loose if you swore at them! They'd hit you; then give you a job, or something like that. [...] But now you can swear your head off, and they don't do nothing. I prefer the old system. The kids didn't used to play up so much. [Jock]

Tim, Bill and Frank, in the group interview, voice similar criticisms:

Bill: It's got less strict.

Frank: It's got softer. You can tell a member of staff to "fuck off!"

Tim: If you told a member of staff to eff off when Ed [the former head master] was here, you'd be put on washing up or sent to bed. Now they'd [the staff] probably say sorry!

Frank: It's too soft.

Not all the blame for deteriorating standards is laid at the door of the new staff, however. Larry sheds a slightly different light on this subject, describing the way in which some pupils have used the unstable staff situation to create difficulties for the new staff:

They [the new staff] didn't know the system, so the kids bent them round their little finger. Me as well. I was probably the worst offender. If you ask any of the staff, they'll say it was me. [Larry]

Frank is equally candid:

The present staff couldn't do nothing. [...] If you're smoking in your room, they can't stop you. We take advantage of the system. If they say you can't do something, we just tell them to fuck off. [Frank]

Virtually all of the boys, however, feel the lack of strictness of the present staff to be a flaw in "the system". As Frank puts it: "it was better then, even though it was stricter." Jock also declares: "I prefer the old system."

In spite of a general sense of yearning for the old system, there are those who see some value in the new system, particularly from a therapeutic standpoint:

Now things are better because they take you out more. You can go to the youth club. Or go to the pictures if you want - on your own. Well, that happened once. I suppose you have been given a lot more responsibility to yourself, but not to other people. [Larry]

Here Larry is hinting at the sense of security that can be derived from having difficult decisions made for you by someone else. He is suggesting here, obliquely, that it is a desire to avoid this type of personal responsibility that lies behind the yearnings for the old system. It was harsher then, but more clearly structured. More rule bound, but more predictable. In short, more secure.

A further factor, which is highly significant to the present level of antagonism of pupils to staff, is the intense popularity of the former head master, Edgar (Ed, as the pupils all refer to him). This man was considered to be "hard" and "strict", but, at the same time, was and is loved by many of the pupils. As Tim puts it:

If you swore Ed'd come over and clout you round the head.
But everyone liked him. Everyone respected him. [Tim]

Larry makes a similar remark:

There was less freedom when Ed was here, but the whole atmosphere of the school was different. It was a happier place then [...] Ed was good fun. He was very strict. [...] I [...] think he did a good job. He was a good laugh, but he was strict. He knew when to be strict and when to have a laugh. [Larry]

Consequently, because of the high regard for him, when Ed retired owing to ill health, the pupils, by and large, were extremely upset. Stan describes this devastation:

The whole place was upset when Ed left. He was the sort of person who, if you didn't know him very well you could get on with him. The atmosphere in the school has changed as well. There are more kids messing about; smashing windows and everything. [Stan]

The intense popularity enjoyed by Edgar and the distress caused by his departure, made the new head master's task doubly difficult. Larry, once again, shows great perception in his comments on this situation:

[...] maybe it's because I wanted Ed to stay. I didn't want him to leave. So it changed my view of the new head master. I didn't like the sight of him when he walked in the door, in any case [...] because he was new. [Larry]

Here Larry recognizes that it is not so much the failings of the new head master, that make him unpopular, as the sense of grief attached to the loss of Ed. This is the same as saying that the animosity felt towards Donald is not essentially personal. Arthur, however, sees things differently; he questions Donald's competence:

Ed was great! He was different from Donald. He knew what he was doing. He knew how to manage the money properly. Everyone liked him. Everyone got on. Everyone respected him [...] I don't trust Donald at all. [Arthur]

Arthur cites the recent purchase of the large security door in the school vestibule as an example of Donald's mismanagement of school funds.

The previous head's personal style, as we have seen, was to be very domineering towards the pupils. The new head, Donald, has a quite different style, and, in the boys' eyes suffers from the comparison:

Frank: Donald's too soft [...] When Ed was here, if everyone was talking in the dining room, as soon as Ed walked in everyone would be quiet.

Bill: As soon as Donald walks in, everyone carries on - kick the chairs and everything.

This criticism crystalizes the feelings of many pupils towards the change of head master. The common response to this sudden relaxation of rules is described in terms of rebelliousness: kicking chairs, vandalism, swearing at staff. Other staff also are seen in the same light. Only Charlie, a teacher who was present under the former head, is exempt from this pupil view:

It's the old staff that made the place. I've got more respect for Charlie, because he's strict and fair. [Tim]

Efforts by the new head to impose "strictness" are scorned by the pupils.

In their eyes he does not command the necessary respect:

Donald tries to act strict, but no-one listens to him. They just give him mouth, and walk off! [...] He doesn't do nothing. [Arthur]

Not only does Donald lack, in the eyes of pupils, Ed's personal qualities, but also he does not back up his attempts at strictness with the threat of a "clout" as Ed is reputed to have.

Lack of strictness then, is a source of great dissatisfaction among the boys. The consequent disorder is both the pupils' response to the lack of strictness as well as a major facet of this dissatisfaction, as is non-co-operation with staff:

It would be better if everybody would try to co-operate more with the staff. Instead of thinking that the staff are the screws and we are the prisoners. Some of them have got a prison attitude here. Not me! [...] They're trying to break the system all the time. That's what really gets on the staff's nerves, because a lot of the time we do break it. [Larry]

This is an ironic statement, coming, as it does, from the lips of a self-confessed ring leader, who admits to deliberately breaking "the system" when opportunities present themselves. In fact Larry admits at one point:

I think it should be more stricter. But if they get it more strict, I'm going to be the one that's breaking all the rules!

[Larry]

This paradoxical statement perhaps indicates the desire for a strict system which takes away individual responsibility from the boys. Whilst Larry believes it would be better if the boys co-operated with the staff, he is also tacitly recognizing the difficulties and responsibilities that come with this. It is, therefore, easier to challenge the system which offers this opportunity, rather than take up the offer. Frank points to ways in which the present regime might be seen to engender the "prison attitude" described and demonstrated by Larry:

The only bit of freedom you get is Saturday afternoons [...]
All the rest of the time you're supervised. Apart from when
you're having a bath, on the toilet, or asleep. That's the only
time you're not supervised. [Larry]

The lack of unsupervised leisure time is a common complaint (7/9), but it is also a commonly held belief that there is more freedom for boys under Donald than there was under Ed (8/9).

The fact that evening activities are compulsory is another source of dissatisfaction. This problem is commonly linked with the supervision issue:

Frank: When I'm at home, I go down the clubs and pubs with my brother. Here you have to go to the boring youth club. It's childish.

Tim: Yeah. I went to the snooker club with Tony [member of staff]. And I wanted half a lager and lime. But no! I was going to get pissed on that, wasn't I? Half a lager and lime! I had to have a coke instead!

This also brings us back to the status issue, via a slightly different route. These boys are complaining that they are being treated like

children at school, whilst at home they enjoy the status of young adults, in certain circumstances. This also applies to freedom of access to the school kitchen. Several boys (4/9) complain of this problem, and the greater freedom they enjoy in this area at home.

In spite of the complaints associated with the change of head master, there are positive outcomes from this situation also, which are recognized by some pupils. Jock says:

I couldn't talk to the old staff [...] I used to be scared of Ed. I couldn't talk to him. [Jock]

Jock's feelings towards Ed are atypical, but based on a clearly recalled incident, in which Jock, during his first few weeks at Lakeside, became involved in a fight with another boy. The other boy reported the incident and Jock was immediately punished, without being given the opportunity to speak in his own defence. He bitterly recounts what he sees as lying behind Ed's behaviour:

Because I had been thought of as a bully in my old school, he thought I was doing it then. So he didn't listen to my side.
[Jock]

This was clearly a deeply hurtful episode for Jock. Here he suffered the humiliation of being punished "without a trial". As a result of this Jock claims he became withdrawn from the staff, and expresses relief at having a new group of staff with whom he feels free to discuss his difficulties:

The old staff were friendly, but not as friendly [as the new staff]. The new staff are friendly and you can get away with murder with them

[...]

I used to talk to no-one, when I had a problem. I talk to anyone now, about my troubles.

Jock mentions the new deputy head master (Maurice) in particular, as a person who is willing to sit down and talk about things with the boys. Maurice, in fact, is singled out by other boys (5/9) as the epitome of the new "soft" regime, and, at the same time, as a caring, sympathetic, understanding and helpful individual:

I still respect Maurice, because he's more than fair. [Tim]

Yes, they [the staff] do [care]. Especially Mo' [Maurice], Hamish [head of care] and Charlie [...]. He's [Charlie] a really good talker; he can really talk to you and make you understand what's happening. And he gives you new ideas [...] when he's talking to you about your problems. [Larry]

Stan refers to his form teacher in a similar way:

I think he's [John] helped me quite a bit. He's helped me with my work. Talked to me quite a bit. Like I never used to like going out any where to do anything. Now I feel quite happy to go to snooker clubs, to [nearby city]. John's got me involved in the snooker club. I never used to play snooker before.

This sense of the new staff being generally more approachable and helpful than the former staff is repeated by many pupils (8/9).

Thus in spite of many negative views of the changes that have taken place at Lakeside, there are many positive aspects also, which seem to enable pupils to maintain a generally positive attitude to the school as a whole. There is a sense expressed by some of the boys also, that the school is still undergoing a process of change, and that the trauma of this change is the main source of difficulty, rather than the actual changes.

Some boys believe that the situation will improve with the healing effects of time:

Things will get better. They'll settle down. [Arthur]

The whole school was upset when Ed left. He was the sort of person, who, if you didn't know him, you could get on with him. The atmosphere in the school has changed as well. There are more kids messing about, smashing windows and everything. In that way it has got a lot worse. But it will get better eventually. [Stan]

I dunno. Maybe it's changing for the better. If you'd have asked me a year ago, I'd have said, "no, it's changing for the worse." But I suppose I'm getting used to the system. [Larry]

What does emerge with great power from the debate about the changes, is an indication of the difficulties that can accompany attempts to alter an established pattern of organization, regardless of the merits or benefits of such changes. These difficulties are magnified by the fact that they coincide with what is clearly felt by most of the boys to be a deep personal loss, in the form of Ed's retirement.

3. Comparison Between the Pupils' Present Situation and Other Situations and Institutions

Six of the 9 boys have spent a substantial amount of time (2 or more years) in comprehensive schools. Five boys had experience of other special schools. Three of the boys spent the school holidays in children's homes (including Larry), the remainder went home to their families, in the

holidays. These are, therefore, the major areas of experience that form the basis for the pupils' comparisons.

According to pupils, teachers at Lakeside are less formal, less strict, and generally more helpful and concerned about the welfare of their pupils than teachers in comprehensive schools. The point about "strictness" is of interest in the light of reflections about the changes in the regime at Lakeside, since it is presented in the present context, as a positive feature of Lakeside staff, and an indication of their more humane approach to their pupils:

Teachers in comprehensives are all stuck up. Here they're flexible. Staff are more friendly. You can call them by their first names and everything. Staff will give you more time, if you want to talk to them. Charlie will stay with you, even if he is off duty, until it is sorted out. They have more time for you. [Frank]

Examples of staff flexibility and greater humanity, cited by different pupils, are: their involvement in the maintenance of the school, such as "unblocking the toilets" (Larry), and their willingness to take pupils out of school to local sporting events, and other places of interest, and their willingness to listen and offer constructive advice when pupils wish to talk about personal problems. Tom chooses what is for him a particularly significant example of the way in which staff will listen to pupils and take them seriously. He describes an incident in which Donald, the head master, was about to punish him for a misdemeanor he was alleged to have committed. The head, however, changed his position after hearing Tom's explanation of events. This contrasts markedly with Tom's experience of comprehensive school, where he claims he was often punished when he was

innocent. The punishments at Lakeside, he claims, are more harsh, but this is of less significance than the fact that here pupils are given the chance to speak in their own defence, are listened to, and are taken seriously:

Say if someone shouted out something [in class, at his comprehensive school], and I got blamed for it, and I got kicked out. And I said it weren't me, and they said they're pretty sure it was, and still chucked me out. I was just kicked out, and that was all. Nothing else could happen to you [...]
It's better when they listen to you. [Tom]

Tom, recognizes that it is perhaps easier for staff in a small school with small classes to offer pupils this more personal attention, and so does not appear to be bitter about the injustices he may have suffered:

In my old school there was about as much kids in every class as in this [whole] school, and there's 6 classes in each year and 5 years. They hadn't got time to listen to you. [Tom]

The advantages of the superior staff-pupil ratio, are not seen solely in disciplinary terms, however, as Tom says:

You can speak to them [the Lakeside staff]. They sort out your problems for you.

Tom's observations are of particular interest when we recall his earlier remarks that Lakeside is a "rubbish" school. It appears that his major grievance against the school is the fact that it does not offer what he feels to be a sufficient level of academic work, and he wants to return to his former comprehensive school in order to sit public examinations. This makes his remarks about the pastoral work of Lakeside all the more

interesting and valuable, in that he clearly feels no need to rationalize his presence there.

The lack of educational opportunity at Lakeside, compared with that available in a mainstream comprehensive school, is, however, a source of complaint among several pupils (6/9):

I feel I'm getting thicker whilst I'm here [...] There's less chance to do the subjects everyone else is doing in a normal school. [...]
You're missing out on physics and chemistry. If I go back to my old school, I'll have a lot of catching up to do. 'Cos if I go back I'll only have a year and a quarter left [...] to get ready for my exam's. [Tom]

At the time of interview Tom has recently consulted the head of care about his anxieties in this area. As a result of this discussion he has written a letter to his former school, which appears to amount to a request to return to the school in order to study for the examinations of which he speaks. Tom's concerns are repeated by other pupils also:

The education here is pathetic! I was doing exam's before I came here [...] My reading age hasn't improved since I was nine.
[Tim]

It's [Lakeside] helped me in other ways, but not with my education [...] I was doing 'O' level maths. before I came here. Now I can't even do fractions. [Frank]

Larry makes a similar point, linking poor educational prospects with the school's lack of "strictness", and unintentionally shows how increased freedom can lead to the exercise of greater personal responsibility:

It's nowhere near as strict [at Lakeside, as it is at a comprehensive school], and you don't do half as much work here. That's bad, that is. I can't stand work, myself [...] it's

boring. But when you were at senior school, and you were made to do it, you learned a lot more. I don't want to do it, but sometimes I think you've got to do it, or you'll regret it when you get older. So I have a go! [Larry]

Interestingly, Frank, whilst recognising the greater academic possibilities offered by the comprehensive school he left, does not wish to return to such a school. He claims to have been offered a place at a comprehensive, but has turned it down. He says that he prefers to stay at Lakeside, where staff are less "stuck up" and more sympathetic in their dealings with pupils.

Experience of mainstream schooling for many of these (6/9) boys was conflict ridden. Tim, Bill, Frank, Fred, Tom and Jock, all claim to have participated regularly in disruptive classroom behaviour:

I used to get bored in class, so I'd throw things. [Jock]

I was always messing around in my old school. I'd start playing around, and that, in lessons [...] shouting out, talking, standing up. [...] Just walking around like. [Tom]

Jock and Tim also admit to having been bullies. All of these boys give the impression of having had very strained relationships with staff at their former schools. Also, all of these boys refer to the better quality of relationships they share with staff at Lakeside.

Larry is unique in this sample, in that he claims to have suffered no particular difficulties at the comprehensive school where he was a pupil prior to Lakeside, and it is the contrast between Lakeside and his family home that is of greatest significance to him:

The atmosphere in the ordinary school was O.K. But as soon as I got home it was the atmosphere at home which really made me uneasy and nervous all the time. When I got here I could relax a bit. [Larry]

Jock also expresses reservations about his family home:

It's usually horrible [at home] [...] when our dad's there. He spoils all the fun. I'm not allowed to smoke at home until I'm 18. You're not allowed out after 8 o'clock. Our sister's 23 and she's not allowed to do what she wants [...] Some kids love being at home. I can't stand it [...] I'm always glad to come back [to Lakeside]. [Jock]

Lakeside is preferable to Jock for other reasons, also:

There's no-one to talk to [at home]. Nothing to do all day. I just stay in the house and watch the telly. Here I've got something to do everyday. There's not one day I get up and think, "what am I going to do today?" I always find something to do. [Jock]

There is a complex of problems here, that Jock is aware of. He has been at Lakeside for 6 years, which means that he has lost touch with former friends in his home area, because of the lengthy absences. Also since he has been at Lakeside his parents have moved to another part of the city, where he knows no-one. Thus his home environment has diminished in its attraction not only because of family difficulties but because of the loneliness and boredom associated with home visits as well.

For other pupils, however, home life has clear advantages over Lakeside. Tim and Frank complain of the lack of freedom at Lakeside, whilst during the holidays (Frank returns to his family home, Tim to a children's home) they enjoy much greater freedom of movement. Tom complains that Lakeside is "too spread out from places"; he "can't stand

the countryside", preferring the city environment of his family home. Bed times are also a source of complaint for several pupils(4/9). Stan shows, however, how both the home and the school environment can be seen to have pros and cons:

In some ways this school is better than a comprehensive. In other ways it isn't. Going home at nights and seeing my mates. That's what I miss most, is seeing my mates. And going to bed at 10 o'clock, whereas I go to bed at 11.30 at home [...]. When I went home I used to miss chatting to people [at night when in bed]. But now one of my mates usually stays [...]. Most nights, me and Larry usually have a fag in bed at night [at Lakeside], with the windows open. We don't reckon it's dangerous, 'cos we always make sure the fags are out and everything. I'll miss that at home [when he leaves], because my mum and step-dad don't like smoking. [Stan]

This is a particularly interesting statement, both for the maturity with which Stan balances the two experiences, and for the fact that Stan claims to have come to the school as a boy who found difficulty in making relationships with peers, now a major attraction of the school is related to the "mates" he has there.

Arthur is the only boy who directly compares Lakeside with another special school. He has been at Lakeside for 3 years. Prior to being here he was at a special school, at first as a boarder and later as a day pupil. He is quite unequivocal about which school he prefers and why:

[the staff at Lakeside] they're a lot better. They're more like people! When I was at Rushforth [special school], they were more like robots really. You do something wrong, the first thing they do is grab 'em and stick 'em in a room, and just lock them up! Like here, they just talk to you. Just tell you what you've done wrong, and have a good go at you. And you know you've done wrong. So you just have to take it [...]. Sometimes you don't want to listen. They just let you go and have a walk, and come back, and talk to you later. [Arthur]

So this section ends where it began, on a point agreed by all the boys: that the staff at Lakeside are valued for their caring, humane attitudes towards the pupils, and this contrasts dramatically with most boys' previous school experience, and the home experience of some boys.

4. *Pupils' Relationships with Other People in the School*

The reader will already have noted that a central theme running throughout the boys' perceptions of Lakeside school, is the importance of staff-pupil relations. It has already been shown that the staff are seen as being more friendly, more understanding, and generally more helpful to pupils than the staff many boys have known in other institutions. Furthermore, the Lakeside staff can provide pupils who have unsatisfactory family relationships with important emotional support, as is seen from remarks made by Jock and Larry. Larry recalls a specific incident, which reveals the type of support that some staff give to pupils:

There was an incident a couple of weeks ago, where I was piling my plate up with food, 'cos I was starving [...] Charlie [a teacher] said, "leave enough for everybody else." And with that, I just slammed my knife and fork down and walked out! He came after me, after about 15 minutes, when I'd had a good cry in the bathroom, and said, "try not to worry too much about what's happening." I can't remember what he said now, but he gave me new ideas. [Larry]

Larry explains that his problem, on this occasion, is related to the break-up of a relationship with a girlfriend. It is perhaps significant that

Larry does not remember exactly what Charlie said to him, but Charlie's consideration, and supportive understanding are vividly recalled. This member of staff clearly took Larry's state of mind and emotional state seriously, and looked beyond the superficial "misbehaviour".

In addition to the deeper emotional support offered by staff, of particular importance to many pupils is the willingness of staff to share their personal interests with the boys. Tim and Frank speak appreciatively of this. Stan hints at the closeness of the relationship he has with his form teacher, describing how it extends beyond the classroom, and how in so doing helps to meet some of his deeper personal needs:

I think he's helped me quite a bit. He's helped me with my work. Talked to me quite a bit. Like I never used to like going out anywhere, to do anything. Now I feel quite happy to go to snooker clubs. [...] John [the teacher] takes quite a few of us there. We save our pocket money from the weekend to go there.
[Stan]

Stan seems to be saying that John has helped him to tackle problems both through personal counselling, as well as through arranging social activities for John, and perhaps importantly, other boys. Visits to the snooker club have become a social focus for Stan, which he shares with other boys in the school. Counselling is an important service offered by the staff to boys; Tim and Frank single out Maurice and Charlie for their willingness and skills in helping boys through emotional crises. Stan extends this view to staff in general, and one member in particular:

The staff are more prepared to sit down and talk to you, and talk your problems out. They'll help you out with anything. There was this one member of staff, Fiona, she's left. She used to remind me of my sister and that, 'cos she's the same age as my sister and everything. I used to be able, if I'd got any

problems, to talk to her. [Stan]

Tom, who describes the school as "rubbish", also has praise for the staff:

I reckon most of them do [care]. If not all of them. Some staff have activities that are quite rubbish. Like, when they get in the staff room, they have quite a big battle with other staff, that we should have better things and that. [Tom]

It is necessary for Tom to underline the fact that not all staff are worthy of praise, through the use of his favourite adjective, but he is quite clear that some staff care about the boys enough to champion their cause in staff meetings; this displays a sense of trust and confidence in the staff. He is equally clear that he would have no such expectations of the teachers in a comprehensive school:

You didn't get to know them [teachers in the comprehensive school] that well. You're only getting about 35 minutes a day with them, with everyone else. I don't think they cared. They said, "it's your life. It's up to you. You do what you like!"
[Tom]

In many of the quotations already presented in this section, a clear sense emerges of the high level of trust that pupils have in staff; even if this trust does not always transfer readily into respect. This is also reflected in stress placed on the fairness of staff in disciplinary matters by several boys (5/9).

The importance to the boys of their relationships with staff, as a basis for their sense of security and general satisfaction, is underlined by the trauma which is associated with the retirement of Ed, and the difficulties which the boys seem to have in accepting his replacement. Ed

is hailed by the boys as an excellent organizer, a strict but fair disciplinarian, a sympathetic listener and someone with a good sense of humour. Dissatisfaction with the current regime is nearly always mentioned with reference to the way "Ed used to run things". The power of this feeling for Ed is emphasised by the indication that at least some of the dissatisfaction with the current regime has its basis in feelings of personal loyalty to Ed, rather than genuine difficulties with particular situations. Changes which are acknowledged, on one hand, as improvements are played down, so as to suggest only a sense of decline since Ed's departure. The dissatisfaction, for instance, that is voiced over the removal of the Leaders system is seldom tempered by the admission that, in certain instances, it provided a bullies' charter. Whilst it is generally acknowledged that bullying has declined with arrival of Donald and the demise of the Leaders system, these changes are never openly credited to the new head master. It is as if such an acknowledgement would be an act of disloyalty to Ed. The same is true over the issue of staff behaviour towards boys: the positives associated with less rigid and more tolerant staff approach to the boys, are only tacitly admitted for the most part, whilst the negatives are stressed. Even when negative aspects of the old system are aired, there is a tendency to underplay their significance. This is particularly true of the few criticisms made of Ed. One such criticism, which has very serious implications, is spoken by Larry:

Ed was good fun. He was very strict. I know a few things about Ed which I didn't like about him. Things like, he used to pay a kid to keep the school running - if you know what I mean. I got to know quite a few things about him which turned me off him a bit. But I still think he did a good job. He was a good laugh, but he was strict. He knew when to be strict and when to have a laugh. [Larry]

Elsewhere, the notorious Archibald is mentioned in this connection, as a "favourite" of the former head master. In spite of this, however, strenuous efforts are made to absolve Ed of particular blame and to stress his positive qualities:

Frank: [Archibald] he used to blackmail kids.

Tim: The old head had favouritism towards him.

Frank: Only 'cos he was getting soft towards the end!

Frank is here referring to Ed's deteriorating health: the factor which led to his premature retirement.

Group and unit meetings are important events which take place at the beginning of everyday. In these meetings boys and staff gather together to discuss items of importance relating to the school community. All of the boys interviewed claim that these meetings provide them with an opportunity to talk in public about matters which they feel to be of significance. It is commonly stated (6/9) that much of the time in such meetings is taken up with the discussion and allocation of maintenance projects in and around the school. Larry complains about the meetings:

[the meetings are] a waste of our time, when we could be doing something else. Like having a fag or something [...].
[At unit meetings] you just talk about your area in particular [ie. the living unit]. Things like what damage has gone on. What doors have been bust off, tellies bust; stuff like that [...]. We used to have big meetings when Ed was here, where everyone talked about one thing. They were useful sometimes.
[Larry]

Other pupils, however, suggest that the meetings provide them with an input into the day to day decision making in the school, and the chance to air

•

opinions on practical and organizational matters. The creation of "the club hut", and the personalized decor in the boys' bedrooms are claimed to be products of this sort of negotiation. Several pupils (3/9) describe other channels whereby input into decision making can be made, particularly the use of informal individual or group approaches to staff members. Maurice is singled out as a staff member who will take pupils' suggestions to staff meetings, and will report back with a decision. This suggests that it is at staff meetings where much of the decision making in the school takes place. It is clearly of importance to pupils, however, that they have access to channels of involvement in the decision making process.

The presence of a "prison attitude" among some of the pupils at Lakeside (see the previous section) is indicative of an active "underlife" within the school. Whilst Larry claims not to share this "prison attitude", he admits to being one those who "breaks the system":

It would be better if everyone would try to cooperate more, instead of thinking that the staff are the screws and we are the prisoners. Some of them have a prison attitude here; not me! [...] They're trying to break the system all the time. That's what really gets on the staff's nerves. 'Cos a lot of the time we do break it. Me an Tim are always doing it. But we enjoy it because it's danger again [...]. It's to get into trouble, but also to get out of trouble. But staff don't know whether they are coming or going half the time. Because we tell them so much bull-crap that they don't know which is truth or not! [Larry]

The thrill of the chase attracts Larry to "system breaking". He enjoys pitting his wits against the staff. This underlying conflict which forms a part of the hidden agenda in the school, also manifests itself when attempts are made by the staff to confront the pupils en masse over disciplinary matters. Larry explains:

Recently there's been a whole lot of nicking going on at weekends. And instead of speaking to each kid individually, Hamish [head of care] has to bring it up in assembly, in front of everybody. So it just makes it worse. He doesn't get anything out of it. It's just made the whole school uneasy. He's gained who did some of it, but not who did all of it. So it's made the whole school uneasy. So it wouldn't surprise me if it was a bad night tonight. And Hamish will be asking, "why was it a bad night?" tomorrow. [...] He talked to a few people, first, individually, and he didn't get anything out of it at all, because nobody would speak to him. So he thought, "maybe if I put another to somebody and put 2 and 2 together, it might work that way." He tried doing that and didn't get anything out of it, 'cos everybody kept their mouth shut. Everybody knew about it, what was going on, except the staff didn't.

[Larry]

Larry's frank and complex view of this situation provides a fascinating insight into a pupil's perspective on staff-pupil conflict. Larry also indicates something more of the "underlife" of the school, and, by implication, shows how the underlife itself can be seen as a response to insensitive staff behaviour. Larry believes that Hamish has made a mistake by using a group meeting to openly challenge the solidarity of the pupil group. A consequence of this has been to draw up battle lines. The situation has escalated from a petty theft inquiry to a battle of the sub-cultures, in which potential conflicts of loyalty surface. Any pupil who passes information to staff will be seen to betray the pupil group. A further consequence of this conflict is a possible "bad night", in which there will be many incidents of uncooperative pupil behaviour. The rights and wrongs associated with the theft of pupils' personal property are forgotten, and it is Hamish's challenge to the pupil group which is uppermost in Larry's view of this situation. These projections can be seen as approximating closely to Rosser and Harré's (1976) application of the concept of "secondary deviance" (Lemert, 1967) to disruptive pupil

behaviour, in terms of "equilibration" and "reciprocity" strategies. At the heart of this conflict seems to be a "no grassing" code:

I know who did it, but I'm not going to let on 'cos I'm not a grasser. I know that sounds stupid, 'cos you'd be helping them, but - If you don't grass on somebody you can have a little more trust in somebody and let them know what's happening. I'm the kind of person who likes to know what's happening. There are some grassers you wouldn't tell anything. Tim and me are the two people who know everything that goes on in this school. [Larry]

At stake is individual credibility within the pupil group: grassing results in virtual exile. The "bad night", which might follow Hamish's challenge, can be seen as an equilibration strategy, in which the pupils reassert the solidarity of their sub-group against the group that has threatened them. Individual participation in these events also becomes a sign of group identification.

An important qualification to Larry's remarks about an anti-school sub-culture is provided by a number of pupils (3/9) who describe Larry and Tim as being particularly deviant pupils. Jock makes particular reference to them in this regard. He also indicates support for a new school rule which prohibits the boys from entering any other but their own living unit. Jock believes that this will help prevent innocent parties from being implicated in thefts of personal property from units. The implication to be drawn from this is that whilst Larry does represent a facet of the pupil culture, that it would not be accurate to characterize the pupil group solely in his terms. It must be also noted, however, that because of the presence of an anti-system element, the type of whole group

challenge mounted by Hamish (according to Larry) is the life blood of such an element, because it thrives on conflict.

Relationships among the boys are considered generally (7/9) to be good. This is particularly so among the senior boys, but there is a feeling (5/9) that junior boys are now "too cheeky", since the arrival of Donald. This is believed to be caused partly by the general decline in staff "strictness", the decline in the authority of senior boys, particularly since the abolition of the "Senior Leaders", and the fact that junior boys now live and sleep in a separate unit from the senior boys. Jock, however, still feels some sense of responsibility for the junior boys:

[...] I tell the kids what to do. I don't tell them to smash windows, or anything like that - I stop them from doing that. But if they're under age smoking, or anything like that, I'll tell them to get away. The reason I do that is 'cos everyone's scared of me - but I don't hit them - [...] I don't know why.
[Jock]

Several boys (5/9) refer to the fact that they have contact with other boys from Lakeside during the school holidays. Others, however, make reference to the undesirable nature of their fellow pupils, because of their delinquency. Stan says:

[...] I don't like many of the boys. There's a few who live round me, but I don't make any attempt to see them in the holidays, 'cos most of them have been in trouble for nicking stuff. [Stan]

Frank and Tim talk about the influence of delinquent boys on them. Tim claims that he "didn't have any trouble with the police" prior to becoming a pupil at Lakeside:

Since I've been here, I've nicked a car, robbed a house, broken into a shop. I would never have dreamed of doing anything like that before I came here. [Frank]

Tim blames the influence of delinquent boys he has met since being at the school. Frank makes similar claims. These remarks are interesting in that they relate to views expressed by other boys that Tim and Frank are often at the centre of delinquent activities in and around the school. Frank describes an incident involving himself and Tim, with some relish:

[...] we skived off tech. once. Stole a book and a bag of toffees. Went into a café. We stole some money from a bus as well, but got caught by the driver. We got off with a caution that time! [Frank]

The quality of the relationships between the boys and between boys and staff are such that all the boys claimed that upon leaving the school they would miss both boys and staff. Even those pupils who express open hostility to the school find very positive things to say about the caring attitudes of staff. A major difficulty for many boys, as has been noted already, was caused by the need to adjust to the loss of staff with whom they shared good relationships.

5. *Freedom, Restrictions and Rules*

In section 2 it was seen that a common source of dissatisfaction among the boys was seen to be the general lack of staff "strictness". The basis for this feeling was the contrast observed by most boys between the present and the former regime of management imposed by the staff. It was felt that the decrease in strictness had led to a deterioration in behavioural standards among the boys, in relation to their treatment of the school's fixtures and fittings, in the level of respect shown by juniors to senior boys, and in the level of co-operation with and politeness to staff. The boys, for the most part, preferred the stricter regime and favoured staff who were "strict and fair", as opposed to simply fair. The new head master was repeatedly criticized for his failure to live up to expectations created by the former head master. The regime now in operation is characterized by and castigated for its "softness". This constellation of attitudes leads us to some interesting speculations about the link between "freedom" and pupil satisfaction, which will be explored in this section.

It is universally acknowledged by the boys that they are permitted greater personal freedom under the new regime, than they were permitted under the old regime. As Stan puts it:

We don't get much freedom here, but it's enough. We get more freedom here than we used to get under the old head master.
[Stan]

Jock echoes this sentiment almost exactly:

It was a lot stricter in the old days [...] I think we get

enough [freedom]. If you want to go on a walk, you can. In the olden days you used to have to go out with [...] a leader. [Jock]

"Freedom" is regularly related to opportunities to leave the school grounds, or to move freely within the school grounds, and to engage in individual or group activities that are not structured or in any way led by staff. Tim and Frank in particular complain of the high level of supervision to which they are subjected throughout their time at Lakeside, complaining that it is often unnecessary, such as when they are watching T.V. Larry also feels that there should be more freedom of movement, but believes that this is not appropriate in the present circumstances :

[it would be better] if we could be trusted a bit more to go out on our own [...] At the moment it should be kept as it is, but in future we ought to be allowed out more. [Larry]

Larry believes that the present levels of disruption and vandalism warrant the postponement of such a relaxation. Jock supports this view:

In the olden days, you'd be invited to someone's room, and it was alright, but now they can't trust us. [Jock]

These views on the need to restrict pupil freedom, clearly link the notion of "strictness" with pupil behaviour. These pupils seem to believe that rules and restrictions can help to keep boys out of trouble.

Under the old system senior boys seem to have felt a strong sense of responsibility for the "policing" of the school. Senior leaders were responsible for supervising other boys, and acting as substitute members of staff, and also, senior pupils had an informal system whereby they adopted

junior boys and oversaw them during their early days in the school (see Jock's remarks on this subject, in section 1). Furthermore, responsibility was rewarded with additional privileges for those who became senior and junior Leaders, as well as high status among the pupils. The new system of "Helpers" offers what the pupils see as a lower level of reward than the leaders system, partly due to the upgrading of the level of freedom and privileges now available to all pupils. Thus incentives for outstanding and responsible behaviour are seen to be deficient. This situation illustrates graphically Goffman's view that the privilege system in a total institution is best described in terms of the absence of deprivation. The effectiveness of a privilege system is dependent upon the level of deprivation in an institution. From the inmate's point of view there is no need to seek additional privileges if there are no obvious deprivations to be alleviated by the rewards on offer.

An important positive effect of the abolition of the leaders system is seen to be the decrease in bullying which has followed from this. This seems to coincide with a general decrease in levels of external restraint and an increase in the encouragement of internal restraints, which are effects of the new freedoms. As Larry remarks:

[...] You can go to the youth club, or go to the pictures, if you want, on your own - well, that happened once. I suppose you have been given a lot more responsibility to yourself but not to other people. [Larry]

This is not necessarily a comfortable or easy transition for pupils used to a "strict" regime to make, hence the dissatisfaction that accompanies this

change. Some pupils seem to want to be forced to behave, and resent the "softness" of staff who do not force them in this way:

It's too soft [...] The staff couldn't do nothing [...] If you're smoking in your room, they can't stop you. We take advantage of the system. If they say you can't do something, we just tell them to fuck off! [Frank]

In other ways, the new regime attempts to create a sense of group responsibility, by emphasising a sense of public responsibility and shared responsibility, in certain situations. Pupils complain of an incident in which the whole group of smokers was punished with reduction in smoking privileges as a result of a boy who did not have parental permission to smoke, being caught smoking by staff. This, and other incidents of a similar nature, was dealt with publicly, at a group meeting, whilst, pupils claim, under the old system it would have been dealt with by the head very much on an individual basis: only the boy himself would have been punished. Needless to say, this is another situation in which pupils feel the new regime to be unsatisfactory.

Not all pupils, however, find the lack of punitive "strictness" unsatisfactory:

You know where you stand. You know what's going to happen to you if you do something wrong. You know what's going to happen if you do something right [...] You do something wrong [...] here, they talk to you. Just tell you what you've done wrong and have a good go at you. And you know you've done wrong, so you just have to take it [...] Sometimes you don't want to listen. They just let you go and have a walk, and come back, and talk to you later. [Arthur]

Arthur is clear that this more therapeutic approach to "doing wrong" is not always a comfortable experience - "sometimes you don't want to listen" - but it is an established expectation for him, and it places him in a position where he feels secure. In contrast to Frank's contempt for staff who cannot (or, at least, will not) force compliance, Arthur suggests that their patient persistence is inescapable.

Jock believes that there are, in fact, "more rules now" under the new regime, but that rules "don't get used as much". He claims that whilst there are many rules, infringement is no longer automatically punished, as it was under the old regime. Staff are more likely now to "just talk to you" when a rule is broken. This link between "rules" and punishment is an interesting legacy of the old punitive regime. Similarly, the lack of a standardized response to rule infringement is taken as a sign of inconsistency:

The staff are meant to crush your cig's, if they find them on you. I've been lucky. They usually get put back in the sleeping in room when I've been caught. [Stan]

Sometimes they jump on you for small reasons. Say smoking. My mum doesn't want me to smoke. If I was smoking they'd sometimes say, "put that fag out!" Whereas if I was out of bounds, or say, after activities, when I was supposed to be having showers, and I was fagging it across there, sometimes they'd put you on jobs the next day. So really their actions change different to their moods everyday. [Tom]

In class, it is universally agreed that the rules governing pupil behaviour vary from teacher to teacher. This is not seen as a particular deficiency, but seems to be accepted by pupils. Once again, "strictness" is an important category of pupil response. Charlie is regarded as the

most strict of the teachers. Whilst the remaining teachers are seen as lenient and permissive. Tom explains:

These staff are less strict than quite a few at my old school [...]. We don't always do as we are told. But half the time, we're working quite hard. It's quite good being in class. Sometimes we're cheeky. Have a laugh [...]. If I swore at Charlie, I'd get a good hiding, whereas if I swore at Sid [care worker], or Margaret [teacher], so long as they took it as a joke, I'd get away with it. [Tom]

Larry expresses a similar view:

Different staff have different standards. You can mess with Graham, Bernard and Maurice [teachers], but not with Charlie and Diane. You do as you're told in Charlie's class! Though if I had something to say, like if he was having a go at me for something I'd not done, I'd speak up then [...]. It's always been like that though. Some staff strict; some staff not.
[Larry]

The most important quality sought by boys in their teachers is consistency within their own rule systems; consistency between teachers is not a point of significance to these boys.

Where rule making is concerned, the pupils tend to attribute this function to the head master and staff. However, some pupils believe that they have an input into the rule making process, through group and unit meetings, as well as through personal informal contact with staff. Stan sees the group and unit meetings as a valuable forum for voicing concerns:

They're good. Any problems, like anything gone missing of yours, you can talk about it at the unit meeting up here, or, if it's anything serious, like windows getting smashed in your bedroom, you can bring it up at the group meeting. You can discuss problems. And staff bring up good points about the weekend and everything [...]. If you want something changed, if it's to do with the unit, the best thing to do is to get Maurice [deputy head master] here [in the unit] with all the boys. He

listens and tries to get things through. [Stan]

Stan is very clear about the channels of communication which exist for use by pupils who feel there are important problems. Opportunities exist in meetings and through other channels, to have a say in the running of the school, and Stan believes that staff listen to pupils and take their views seriously. Tom echoes this view:

I reckon most of them [the staff] do [care]. If not all of them. [...] Like when they get in the staffroom, they have quite a big battle with other staff, that we should have better things and that. [Tom]

Jock also believes that staff tend to be responsive to the views and attitudes of the boys, and he gives a specific example of his own experience of this:

Every morning there's a morning assembly. Before that, you have a unit meeting. You can bring things up then. Like if you want something doing, like a window fixing or a lock on your door. Or if there's bullying or something [...] The staff usually listen, and discuss our ideas at their Wednesday afternoon meetings. If the staff all agree then it goes through. I wanted a lock on my door. The staff discussed it, but turned it down, because of the fire risk. I accepted that. [Jock]

Jock's reaction is a mature acceptance of a considered response to his request. He is satisfied that a fair procedure has been followed and a reasoned decision has been taken. Other pupils complain that such meetings are a "waste of time" (see above), and claim not to participate. The majority of pupils (6/9), however, believe that the meetings and other channels give them a genuine say in decision making processes within the school community.

6. *Pupils' Perceptions of Their Reasons for Placement at the School*

Of the 9 boys interviewed, 7 gave as one of the reasons for their referral to Lakeside, disruption at school, 4 included family problems, 3 mentioned that they had been referred because they had been bullies in their former schools, 1 mentioned persistent truancy, and 1 mentioned conflict with mainstream school teachers. In common with pupils from Farfield, these boys stressed their own misbehaviour, although the boys referring to "family" problems saw their families at fault also.

Tom clearly shoulders the burden of referral himself:

I got kicked out [of his comprehensive school] because I didn't fit into normal schools. [Tom]

He explains that he went through a succession of mainstream schools before arriving at Lakeside. He gives misbehaviour in class and "cheek to staff" as reasons for his ejection from the mainstream schools, and adds that his family broke up when his parents were divorced; this meant that he required a residential placement. Frank's history is very similar to Tom's, and he adds, "most kids here don't have a normal mum and dad," referring to the prevalence of broken marriages among the pupils' parents. Jock is a little less inclined to see the blame for his referral as resting on him alone:

I had been thought of as a bully in my old school [...] I used to get bored in class, so I used to throw things. Now I could stay in class all day.

Jock denies that he was in fact a bully. He believes that the staff at his former (mainstream) school had a distorted impression of him and labelled him unfairly. Similarly, although he admits to disruptive behaviour at school, he claims that this was caused by boredom. To support his claim he refers to meetings he had with a psychiatrist, who is said to have suggested that Jock misbehaved in class because he was "too intelligent". This view that it was the school that failed Jock, rather than any failure on Jock's part, is also emphasised by his assertion that now he "could stay in class all day". At Lakeside he does not disrupt classes because he does not find lessons boring.

Stan is unequivocal in his belief that it was his own "fault" that he was eventually referred to a residential school, owing to his persistent truancy from the comprehensive school where he was a pupil:

I just couldn't get there, for some reason. I just couldn't face it [...] I used to get bullied a bit, but not much - just average. I don't know why it was. My sister was the same [...] She's 20 this month [...] The staff at the school were alright. It wasn't the school's fault, it was me! [...] I think I must have changed quite a bit [...] I'm not that bothered about going to class now. [Stan]

Stan is determined to eliminate all school causes for his truancy: it was not the bullies or the teachers that made him unwilling to go to school. His mention of his sister is perhaps a hint at his belief that it is some sort of constitutional difficulty that lies at the root of the problem. Similarly, his view that he "must have changed quite a bit", is consistent with the notion that it was his fault that he ended up in a residential

special school. Tom is equally self deprecating, but he does imply some criticism of his mainstream school teachers:

I was always messing around in my old school. Like in lessons. I'd just start playing around and that in lessons. They was trying to make out that I was worse than what I was. Half the time, I was just shouting things out; talking; standing up. Things like that. Just walking around like. They'd tell you to get out. Sometimes, they'd tell you to get out for a little reason, and I'd say, "I ain't getting out!" And there'd start an argument. And then there starts a fight, with me and a member of staff [...]. Then just dragging me out. They was trying to make out I was worse than what I was. [Tom]

Tom's sense of injustice here is clear. Whilst he acknowledges that he did behave badly in school, and that, by and large, he did this from choice, out a desire to have "a laugh", he also feels that at times the staff were unfair. Tom is not bitter about this, however. Tom does not feel that he was wrongly placed, simply that staff exaggerated his misbehaviour. He is, as we have already noted (in section 2), keen to return to his former school in order to sit public examinations. He is sure that, if he is taken back by his old school, he will "behave a lot differently, because I've got exam's coming up." He has faith that his old label as a "trouble maker" can be overcome:

I don't think they'll blame the trouble on me. If I was different in the first place, they wouldn't think it was me.
[Tom]

In common with the other children quoted so far in this section, Tom believes that he has reformed his behaviour since being at Lakeside, and now has a more positive view of himself.

Larry is the only Lakeside interviewee who does not make particular reference to his own behaviour when talking about reasons for his referral. He believes his referral to have been for family reasons:

The atmosphere at the ordinary school was O.K, but as soon as I got home, it was the atmosphere at home which really made me uneasy and nervous all the time [...] My dad used to get on to me for stupid little things: for not doing the family chores if I forgot. [...] I got hit around quite a lot. [Larry]

Larry does admit to having "bunked off school" on a few occasions, but does not elaborate. He makes it quite clear that he has no complaints about the comprehensive school which he attended. His "problems" are entirely related to family difficulties which are rooted in the break up of his parents' marriage and the introduction of a stepmother into the family home. Larry describes the stepmother as "the main problem".

With the exception of Larry, referral stories are indicative of feelings of self blame, and consequently low self image - particularly upon entry to the school. This finding is highly consistent with the Farfield findings.

7. Pupils' Perceptions of the Personal Effects of Their Placements

In common with the Farfield boys, all of the boys interviewed at Lakeside said that their time at the school had brought them positive

personal benefits. They all, however, believed themselves to have suffered certain negative consequences.

On the positive side, the most commonly cited (8/9) effect attributed to the school was the help it had provided with pupils' personal problems and difficulties. In section 4 we saw many pupils claiming that they shared valuable personal relationships with members of staff which had a therapeutic effect. Larry describes the way in which he has been counselled by staff and "given new ideas". In his case, when an important personal relationship came to an end, he felt, as a result of counselling by a staff member that he had the resources to tackle the situation, rather than simply try to avoid it:

I felt like just running away from it. Mind you, I used to always do that! So, "no," I thought. "I'll stick it out this time; see what I can do." [Larry]

Although he admits that the experience of "sticking it out" has been "pretty bad", he claims that he has been supported throughout this situation by staff, particularly Charlie, and pupils, particularly Tim. As a result Larry feels that he has made the right decision. Stan also, it was noted in section 2, feels that he has made considerable social strides since being at the school. When he first came he was a social isolate "never used to like going out anywhere", now, however, he enjoys going to snooker clubs with his form teachers and a group of other boys. He also claims to have made some close friends at the school. Jock also claims that since being at the school, and particularly since the change of head master, he has a new found ability to talk with other people about his

problems, and so unburden himself and move towards solutions through the "new ideas" that staff often seem to offer:

Before I came here, I never used to speak to anyone about my troubles [...]. I used to say nothing to no-one, when I had a problem. I talk to anyone now about my troubles. [Jock]

"Anyone" that is, with exceptions:

I couldn't talk to the old staff [...] I used to be scared of Ed. I couldn't talk to him. [Jock]

Staff and pupil relationships with boys are not the only source of confidence building and support within the school. There is much satisfaction also to be drawn from the experience of being a productive, valued, working member of the school community. Jock is clear about the fact that his time at the school is usefully engaged when he is doing maintenance work. This contrasts with the boredom and inertia of his home life. Stan also has no doubts about the beneficial effects of "jobs" around the school:

The school has made me grow up in myself. Helped me go to school; get on with my classwork. I'm more confident in myself. Being able to do things I never thought I could do. Like last weekend, me and another boy, our job was the front drive. There's me and him went off, quite happy, and filled up some potholes. I'd have never thought of doing that before, or known how to do it. I've learnt to do quite a few things. Yes, you learn things and how to do them properly. [Stan]

From a boy who previously found it difficult to muster the confidence to attend school, or mix with other boys, this is indeed an impressive outcome. Conquering new tasks has helped to build his self image

considerably. Arthur too, has an interesting point to make on this subject:

[...] I got used to it [doing jobs], and it's worth it. It just comes natural. So that when you leave school, you just think, "oh, work - it's just natural." [Arthur]

Once again there is a tone of self-confidence in these remarks which is significant.

Many of the pupils (7/9) believe that the school has led to particular improvements in their behaviour and attitudes. Jock believes that being a pupil at Lakeside has saved him from becoming a delinquent. He explains that both of his brothers (one older, one younger than Jock, who is 17) have spent periods of time in detention centres, and recently, the elder of his two brothers has been sent to prison. One of his brothers and his sister's common-law husband are, at the time of the interview, serving prison sentences. Jock feels that he is lucky to be outside that situation:

If I had been at home, and hadn't come here, I'd probably be in the same place where our brother is at the moment [...]. I used to nick things. Now I haven't got the bottle to nick. It's made me soft, but I respect that. [Jock]

The use of the word "soft" is interesting here. Jock, and others, have used it to describe the new staff. But this does not appear to be a negative term as it is used here. Being "soft" is the opposite of being "hardened". Arthur seems to amplify its meaning further, when he says:

It's [Lakeside] taught me to get on with things and not to argue. Before I came to this school, if someone called me a name, I'd go absolutely mad, and start lashing out. Now I can control it;

take it. [Arthur]

He is clear that the school is responsible for these changes:

This one [school] has [helped]; the other one hasn't. [Arthur]

Tom also sees differences in his own behaviour:

Now I don't mess about so much in different situations. I know when not to mess about. I can't say I've changed a dramatic lot. I suppose I've changed, in that I've grown up slightly. [Tom]

This has the appearance of an assessment tinged with realism. Tom is claiming to be a thoroughly altered character, but he believes that he has undergone significant changes which will be important to his chances of gaining re-admission to his former mainstream school.

Not all of the positive changes the pupils believe themselves to have undergone since being pupils at Lakeside are attributed to Lakeside school specifically. The simple fact of respite from home based problems is significant to 2 pupils (Jock and Larry). Stan believes that had he remained in the comprehensive school, he would have continued to play truant, and so ended up in some form of punitive detention. Jock simply feels that being away from his family home frees him from implication in crime:

Last holiday, I couldn't wait to get back [to school].
[...] There was all this trouble at home with the police. Everyone was involved. It was "receiving goods". Our dad had bought a dodgy telly and a dodgy video off this bloke. It was receiving stolen goods. Our brother was a thief! He puts

stuff on our mum's second hand stall. So the atmosphere in our house was horrible. [Jock]

Jock is well aware of the dangers associated with living in such an environment, where petty crime seems to be a behavioural norm. Not only does Jock feel the need to escape from that, however, but he also needs a refuge from the generally poor quality of family life, as it exists in his home:

The atmosphere in our house was horrible. It's usually horrible, when our dad's there. He spoils all the fun. [...] Some kids love being at home; I can't stand it! [...] My dad hates children. [Jock]

For Larry also, the school has provided him with respite from an unpleasant home life:

[...] it was the atmosphere at home which really made me feel uneasy and nervous all the time. When I got here, I could relax a bit. [...] [Now] I go to a home in the holidays. [Larry]

The need for respite is as strongly felt by these boys as it is by some of those in the Farfield sample.

When it comes to discussing the academic effects of attending Lakeside school, there is overall a less positive view among the boys. Arthur and Stan, who admit to relatively poor academic performance in previous schools feel they have made positive gains academically:

Before I came to this school, I couldn't do maths. or anything.

[Arthur]

Jock also feels that he has made better educational progress at Lakeside, because he does not find the classwork as boring as he did at his previous school. For these boys, Lakeside has removed barriers which have limited their involvement in their former schools.

Other pupils see the school as offering insufficient academic challenge. Frank, Tim and Tom feel that they have gone into academic decline since being at the school (see section 2). Larry feels that staff fail to put enough pressure on pupils to work in class. Thus for these pupils, who appear to see themselves as having been academically successful in their former the schools, the educational content of the school is perceived to be inadequate to their needs.

There is also a feeling among some of the boys that their standards of behaviour have declined since being at Lakeside. Larry, Frank and Tim complain at having committed delinquent acts since they have been at Lakeside, because they have been mixing with delinquent boys. Larry sums this up:

[...] in a way, this school has given me a bit more understanding of life. Maybe a bit in the wrong direction from some of the kids. [Larry]

Tom feels that he has declined in other ways:

I mess around more here than I did in my other school. I do things here I'd never have dreamed of doing. [...] In my old school I'd only swear at staff if I lost my temper. Now I just swear at them all the time, if they say I've got to do something I don't want to do. In my old school I wouldn't have dreamed of swearing at the staff. So I reckon I've got worse here [...] Because everyone else is swearing at the teachers, so you're getting worse because you're following what they're doing. [Tom]

Another negative outcome described by several Lakeside boys (4/9) is that of the stigma attached to attending a special school. This again reflects the experience of the Farfield boys also:

A special school is a school for div's. It means you don't fit into normal schools; into society. I got kicked out 'cos I didn't fit into normal schools. [Tim]

Frank expresses similar feelings. Both feel that the special school sets them apart from the rest of their peers in "normal schools". They feel a sense of rejection; as if they are outcasts. Stan has a more specific tale to tell in order to illustrate his feelings of stigma:

This girl I know, her mum didn't used to like me for ages. For about six months. 'Cos this girl had been spreading rumours. Saying, "he's been in a special school for being in trouble with the police; he goes round smashing windows and everything! And there's this rumour going round our estate that I'm in borstal. I just ignore it. [Stan]

Fortunately for Stan, he now has friends in his home area who know the truth about his residential school, therefore, he does not find the rumours as debilitating as he otherwise might. Jock, whilst not a victim of any such rumour-mongering is wary of this difficulty:

I'd say [if asked] a boarding school. Usually they either call me a snob or something like that. They think of *Tom Brown's*

School Days. I'd say it's not for that, it's for children who've got problems. They'd usually accept that. I'd say family problems, or attitude problems. I don't say trouble with the police or nothing. [Jock]

Whilst Jock feels that he can be relatively honest about the school, he fears the misinterpretations which might spring into the minds of people who thought he attended a school where there were people with histories of delinquency. One of the most poignant complaints relating to this issue is that expressed by Tom, who has been at the school for 12 months:

[...] I see quite a few of them [former school friends from the comprehensives] walking round the streets, but they don't recognize me. I recognize them, but hardly any of them recognize me. [Tom]

It is Arthur, however, who has the most devastating story of the effects of being a pupil at Lakeside:

I got put in a children's home. Everything [at home] went to pieces, about a year ago [...]. It wouldn't have happened, if I hadn't been here. [...] Being away from home such a long time and going back. Me brothers and sisters all start playing me up; they start playing up to show off to you. And your mum thinks, "oh no! It's him. He's back. He's caused all this." [Arthur]

The remarkable thing about Arthur is that in spite of this belief, he still has a very high regard for the school, the staff, and what he thinks they have done for him.

8. Conclusion

There are many similarities between the findings of the Lakeside study and those of the Farfield study. Interviewees expressed generally positive attitudes toward the school and believed that it had many beneficial effects on them. One of the chief vehicles for achieving these effects was found to be the high quality of staff commitment to the pupils, which took the form of counselling and a great deal of personal help. Another important contributory factor here was seen to lie in the school's use of manual work as an educational and therapeutic tool. Pupils also felt that they had a say in decision making in the school. A particularly interesting aspect of this study was provided by the opportunity to observe pupils responses to dramatic changes in the organizational regime of the school. This proved to be a major source of contention among the boys, because it involved a major restructuring of the privilege system within the school, as well as fundamental changes in the way in which the staff related to the boys. A further issue linked with these, was the contrast in managerial style between the new and the former, much loved, head master. There seemed to be an interesting relationship between the pupils' feelings of loyalty to the former head master and their feelings about the changes in the regime. There was evidence of a thriving pupil sub culture, within which it was possible to identify elements which were pro and elements which were anti the official regime. Pupils felt that the school benefitted them in behavioural and emotional terms, and these were linked with their perceptions of the reasons for their referrals to the school; by and large they believed that the faults which had led to their referrals

had been successfully dealt with. Negative effects of the school were felt to be the feelings of stigma it engendered, negative modelling leading to delinquency, and poor educational provision.

CHAPTER SIX

ANALYSIS OF PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRES

In addition to the tape recorded interviews, data for this study was also gathered from questionnaires that were completed by the pupils. Two questionnaires were employed (see appendix I). The purpose behind the use of the questionnaires was to add a quantitative dimension to what is an essentially qualitative study, and to broaden the sample size. In achieving this latter aim, pupils of junior age were included in the questionnaire sample. Boys who had been interviewed were also included in the questionnaire sample.

The study, as it has been presented in the two preceding chapters, has established a broad picture of the pupils' perceptions of their schools. The aim of the questionnaires is to explore the extent to which these views can be seen to be shared by a broader sample of pupils in both schools. The first pupil questionnaire consists of a number of open ended questions, demanding, in some cases, fluent written answers; this format was found to be off putting to some children, hence the poor return rate (Lakeside, 13; Farfield, 32). The second questionnaire is of a more refined and closed nature, being based upon an early analysis of the interview data. Pupils were required to express agreement or disagreement

with statements, by placing either ticks or crosses. Returns of the second questionnaire were higher than for the first (Lakeside, 24; Farfield, 34).

1. *Pupil Questionnaire I*

Number of returns: Lakeside, 13; Farfield 32

This questionnaire sought to ascertain pupils' perceptions of the following items relating to their placement at Farfield and Lakeside:

- (a) degree of school satisfaction
- (b) reasons for placement
- (c) the personal effects of placement
- (d) relationships with staff

(a) *Degree of School Satisfaction (Questions, 4-11, 13, 24, 25 and 27)*

TABLE I

Q4. Do you like being at this school?

Lakeside:	YES, 12	;	NO, 1	;		(N = 13)
Farfield:	YES, 24	;	NO, 4	;	YES+NO 1	(N = 29)
Total:	YES, 36	;	NO, 5	;	YES+NO 1	(N = 42)

TABLE II

Q5. Do you prefer this school to other schools you have been to?

Lakeside:	YES, 9 ; NO, 4 ;	(N = 13)
Farfield:	YES, 20 ; NO, 12 ;	(N = 32)
Total:	YES, 29 ; NO, 16 ;	(N = 45)

Responses to questions 4 and 5 confirm the generally favourable attitudes to their schools of the interviewees. There is, however, a surprisingly high number of negative responses to question 5. This may indicate that there is less satisfaction in this area among boys in the lower age range of the two schools (none of whom were interviewed). This difference might be explained in terms of interviewees' reported growing sense of satisfaction with the school after, sometimes, initially unfavourable early impressions.

TABLE III

Q6. What are the things you like about this school?

Number of responses		Category of response:	Total
Lakeside	Farfield		
6	9	Staff	15
4	8	Leisure	12
-	4	Other boys	4
1	3	Priviliges	4
-	2	Jobs	2
-	2	Education	2
1	-	Security	1
1	-	Environment	1
-	2	Buildings	2
-	3	Freedom	3
Pupils: N=10	N=23 → N =33	Responses: N=46	

These responses reflect many of the issues raised in the interviews. Most notable here is the fact that responses referring to"staff" emerge as a

major category of satisfaction. This points to the central importance of interpersonal relationships in schools such as these. The remaining categories, by and large, relate to the schools' formal organizational structure, which, we have seen from the interviews plays a major role in the pupils' degree of school satisfaction.

TABLE IV

Q7. What are the things you dislike about the school?

Number of responses		Category of response	Total
Lakeside	Farfield		
-	10	"Nothing"	10
1	8	Bullying	9
4	4	Rules	8
-	3	Management Style	3
		Principal/Head	
2	-	Master	2
-	1	Activities	1
1	-	Teachers	1
1	-	Meals	1
1	-	Jobs	1
3	1	Privilege system	4
1	1	Pocket money	2
-	1	Buildings	1
Pupils: N=13	N=23 → N=36	Responses: N=43	

The single largest category of response here is "nothing"; provided entirely by the Farfield sample, and representing the reponse of over half of the boys at that school who returned the questionnaire. This supports the sense that the boys tend to have a favourable attitude towards their school. The second largest category, however, is that of "bullying". This is a fairly rare item in the interview data. Once again, it is the Farfield sample who provide the major evidence here. A notable feature of the Lakeside regime, it will be recalled, was what boys perceived to be a decline in the incidence of bullying since the introduction of the "new regime". This high response may perhaps again, be seen as representing a

particular concern of certain junior children, though, as we have noted, a small number of senior interviewees also complain of this. The 3 outstanding categories from the Lakeside sample are: "rules", "the head master" and "the privilege system". These fall in line with inferences drawn from the interviews, that Lakeside pupils' dissatisfactions tended to centre on the changes that had taken place in the school, since the replacement of the old head master.

TABLE V

Q8. How many other schools have you been to as a pupil?

	Lakeside	Farfield
	N=13	N=30
Mean number of schools attended by each pupil	3	4

TABLE VI

Q9. In what ways, if any, are the staff in this school different from those you have known in other schools?

Number of responses		Category		Total
Lakeside	Farfield	of Response		
7	14	Staff are:	more friendly, kind, cheerful	21
5	7	" "	more caring, patient	12
3	2	" "	more willing to give pupils time	5
3	-	" "	more willing to listen to pupils	3
-	4	" "	the same as in other places	4
-	1	" "	more or too strict	1
-	1	" "	less helpful	1
1	-	" "	less strict	1
Pupils: N=13		N=27 → N=40		Responses: N=48

The majority of pupils in both samples see staff as being more friendly, caring and approachable than staff in other schools. Only 2 pupils indicate an unfavourable response to staff. These responses also indicate

that it is in the manner in which staff relate to the children that is the significant issue here. This supports the interview findings convincingly.

TABLE VII

Q10. In what ways, if any, has the school changed since you have been here?

Q11. Has the school changed, if at all, for the better?

Number of responses		Nature of Change	Better/Worse	
Lakeside	Farfield			
-	14	No change	-	-
-	9	New pupils	9	-
1	5	New staff	6	-
-	3	New buildings	2	1
-	1	Jobs	1	-
3	-	New head master	3	-
3	-	New rules	3	-
3	-	More freedom	3	-
3	-	Leisure activities	3	-
1	-	Less resources	-	1
Pupils: N=13	N=33 → N=46		Responses: N=30	N= 2

Once again, staff and pupils emerge as significant categories in the pupils' perceptions. This further supports the view that the quality of interpersonal relationships are central concerns of pupils in such schools. The most surprising outcome here, however, is the relative lack of comment by Lakeside pupils about the changes that have occurred in the school. Where such changes are referred to, they are seen as positive. There was

some evidence of a positive view of the changes, in the interview sample, but, it was suggested, this tended to be muted out of a sense of personal loyalty to the former head master. We are possibly observing a similar effect here.

TABLE VIII

Q13. Did you choose to come to this school?

Lakeside	Farfield	Total
YES, 9 ;	YES, 16 ;	25
NO, 1 ;	NO, 15 ;	16
DON'T KNOW, 1 ;	- ;	1
N=11 ;	N=31 ;	N=42

The responses to this question reflect interviewees' comments, that pupil consultation over placement is variable. Whilst a high number of Lakeside pupils claim to have made a positive choice, the sample represents less than half the total population. It would seem that this is an area in which a consistent policy, of the type claimed in school documents to be in operation at Farfield, needs to be applied, in a way that pupils fully understand.

TABLE IX

Q24. If you were at a comprehensive school, would you be making better progress in your school work?

Number of Pupils		Total
Lakeside	Farfield	
YES, 5	YES 16	YES, 21
NO, 4	NO 8	NO, 12
N= 9	N=24	N=33

TABLE X

Q25. The school work at this school is too easy. (Tick if you agree)

Numbers in agreement with statement:

Lakeside, 4 ; Farfield, 15 ; Total, 19

These responses reveal a degree of dissatisfaction among the children with the quality of the educational provision at the two schools, which was noted in the interview analyses. When taken in relation to the interview findings, we find the Lakeside response to be surprisingly low and the Farfield response to be unexpectedly high.

TABLE XI

Q27. What changes would you like to see made at the school?

Number of responses		Category	Total
Lakeside	Farfield	of Response	
2	-	Later bed times	2
3	6	Fewer rules	9
1	4	More home visits	5
1	-	New head master	1
3	6	No change	9
-	3	Improved recreational facilities	3
Pupils: N=10		N=19 → N=29	Responses: N=29

There is some dissatisfaction here expressed with rules, though this is less prominent in the Lakeside responses, in keeping with the impression that the new regime is more relaxed and less restrictive. The low response rate, however, implies that there is little pressing need for change, in the minds of pupils.

(b) *Perceptions of Reasons for Placement*

TABLE XII

Q12. Why are you at this school?

Number of Responses		Category	Total
Lakeside	Farfield	of Response	
-	11	Poor educational progress	11
7	8	Disruptive behaviour in school	15
-	6	Family difficulties	6
-	5	Criminal/delinquent behaviour	5
-	3	Truancy	3
-	2	Social adjustment difficulties	2
1	3	Don't know	4
5	-	Positive refusal to answer	5
Pupils: N=13	N=33 → N=46		N=51

With the exception of the 3 "don't knows" and the 5 refusers, the reasons expressed are all indicative of a sense of failing within the pupil. This fits in with the interview findings on this subject. The defensive nature of the refusals (eg. "mind your own business") are consistent with the view that reasons for placement are a source of shame and low self-esteem for some pupils. The conspicuous difference in the two groups' references to educational problems is indicative of the fact that Farfield includes pupils with "moderate learning difficulties" in its target group, whilst Lakeside does not.

(c) *Perceptions of the Effects of the Schools on Pupils (questions 14-17)*

TABLE XIII

Q14. In what ways, if any, have you changed since being at this school?

Number of Responses		Category	Total
Lakeside	Farfield	of Response	
6	11	Improved behaviour	17
-	4	Improved self control	4
3	4	Improved educational performance	7
		Improved ability to make	
-	2	make relationships with staff/boys	2
		Improved sense of responsibility/	
3	2	general attitude	5
-	1	Behaving better towards family	1
1	-	Increased delinquency	1
Pupils: N=11		N=27 → N=38	N=37

Only one out the 38 response indicates a negative change. The vast majority of responses support the view drawn from the interview data that social, emotional and behavioural improvements are felt by pupils to be gained from their time at the schools. As in the interviews, these improvements strongly reflect perceptions of reasons for referral. This also adds support to the suggestion that pupils experience improvements in their self-esteem after a time at the school.

TABLE XIV

Q15. In what ways, if any, has the school caused you to change?

Number of Responses		Category	Total
Lakeside	Farfield	of Response	
4	7	Help from staff	11
1	5	Help from pupils	6
-	1	Being away from family	1
Pupils: N=5	N=13 → N=18		N=18

The low response rate here, perhaps reflects the question's complexity. However, once again the therapeutic value of interpersonal relationships is cited, and there is a mention of "respite" as a therapeutic tool.

TABLE XV

Q16. In what ways has being at school affected your home life?

Number of Responses		Category	Total
Lakeside	Farfield	of Response	
3	7	Don't see enough of Family	10
1	4	Improved relations with family	5
-	1	Increased conflict at home	1
1	1	Effects are "a lot", unspecified	2
1	-	Don't know	1
4	13	No effect	17
Pupils: N=10	N=26 → N=36		N=36

These responses indicate a negative or neutral effect, predominantly, with the largest single group expressing a neutral effect. There is a small

proportion of pupils who claim a positive effect. This would be consistent with the view that where family conflict exists, "respite" might help to at least prevent the situation from worsening.

TABLE XVI

Q17. What sort of ideas do you think people outside the school have about it?

Number of Responses		Category	Total
Lakeside	Farfield	of Response	
6	6	a school for delinquents	12
1	6	a school for mentally sub-normal	7
-	4	a good caring school	4
-	2	a children's home	2
1	3	"bad"	4
1	1	outsiders have no idea	2
-	5	don't know	5
1	-	a public school	1
Pupils: N=10		N=27 → N=37	N=37

These findings tend to support the view that pupils believe the schools to carry negative public images, based on misconceptions of the nature and purposes of such schools. This is also consistent with the feelings of stigma detected among the interviewees.

(d) *Perceptions of Staff* (questions, 18-22; 25 and 26)

A full account of these questions appears in appendix II of this thesis.
Here is a summary of the findings:

TABLE XVII

Q18-22

Teachers give pupils enough help with their school work.	AGREE,	Lakeside, 11,	Farfield, 30	= 41
	DISAGREE,	" 0	" 2	= 2
		N=11	N=32	N= 43
Staff are prepared to listen to pupils' personal problems	AGREE,	" 11	" 25	= 36
	DISAGREE,	" 2	" 6	= 8
		N=13	N=31	N= 44
Most teachers are friendly towards pupils	AGREE,	" 12	" 27	= 39
	DISAGREE,	" 0	" 5	= 5
		N=12	N=32	N= 44
Most care staff are friendly towards pupils	AGREE,	" 13	" 29	= 42
	DISAGREE,	" 3	" 0	= 3
		N=16	N=29	N= 45
Most of the domestic staff are friendly towards pupils	AGREE,	" 12	" 32	= 44
	DISAGREE,	" 1	" 0	= 1
		N=13	N=32	N= 45

Response levels to these questions were high and revealed strongly positive perceptions of the staff, who were seen to be friendly and willing to help the boys with their personal difficulties.

TABLE XVIII

Q25. If you had a personal problem, who would you go to?

Pupils cited the staff in the following order of popularity:

Lakeside		Farfield	
RSW's	(8)	RSW's	(21)
Teachers	(6)	Head master	(13)
Head master	(4)	Other boys	(13)
Domestics	(3)	Teachers	(12)
Other boys	(3)	Stay silent	(8)
		Domestics	(4)
		Other	(1)

[Numbers in brackets indicate number of nominations]

The RSW's (Residential Social Workers) are clearly the most popular choice among the boys, and the professional staff in both schools are rated very highly. This underlines once again the overwhelming significance of staff-pupil relationships, and their importance to the therapeutic process.

TABLE XIX

Q26. Who do pupils believe to provide the most effective help?

Staff are rank ordered in accordance with pupils' choices.

Lakeside		Farfield	
RSW's	(8)	RSW's	(22)
Teachers	(5)	Head master	(18)
Head master	(4)	Teachers	(14)
Domestics	(3)	Other boys	(12)
Other boys	(3)	Someone else	(7)
Someone else	(1)	Domestics	(4)

There are only minor differences in the rank orderings between this question and the previous question. There is a strong impression here that pupils have much faith in the abilities of staff to help them when they are in difficulty. An interesting difference between the two schools lies in the different positions occupied by "other boys". This relates to differences in the pupil sub-cultures of each school, Farfield presenting a

generally more stable and pro-school identity, whilst Lakeside's tends to have more aggressive tendencies in ascendance.

2. Pupil Questionnaire II

The second pupil questionnaire (see appendices I and II) is a refinement of the first questionnaire, and designed to be more accessible to a wider range of pupils, some of whom may have found the first questionnaire too demanding.

In this questionnaire, respondents were presented with 26 items with which they were required to agree or disagree by placing a tick or cross next to the item. The items in the questionnaire were based on 4 hypotheses that were constructed from the first questionnaire and the interview data. The hypotheses are:

- (1) The pupils of this study prefer their present residential placements to:
 - (a) mainstream schools
 - (b) day special schools
- (2) Pupils of this study believe staff in their present schools to be, in comparison to staff of other schools they know:
 - (a) more friendly
 - (b) more helpful
 - (c) more understanding of their personal problems
 - (d) less authoritarian
- (3) Pupils of this study believe their present schools to offer them wider opportunities for success than have previously been available to them. That social behaviour, practical abilities, attitudes and behaviour are considered important areas of development, of at least equal status with academic learning.

- (4) Pupils of this study believe that the major negative consequence of their attendance at a residential school (EBD) are:
- (a) separation from friends, family, and home area
 - (b) feelings of social stigma

The pupils' responses to the questionnaire are presented fully in appendix III of this thesis. There follows here, a brief summary of the data.

There were 24 questionnaires returned by the Lakeside pupils and 33 by the Farfield pupils. This amounts to more than a 75% return rate.

Hypothesis 1 (Questions 1-5)

This hypothesis is supported by both the Farfield and Lakeside samples. The Farfield sample show an overwhelming level of agreement with the first five items of the questionnaire. The Lakeside pupils show a preference for their present school over primary, comprehensive, and day special schools, by a majority of between 2 and 4 (N=24). There is, however, a much stronger agreement among Lakeside boys for the statement: "most of the boys at this school are happier here than they were at other schools" (Lakeside: yes, 16, no 7; Farfield, yes, 24, no, 9).

Hypothesis 2 (Questions 6-13)

This hypothesis is firmly supported by the responses of both samples. The overwhelming majority of pupils from both schools believe the staff there to be: "more friendly" than main stream school staff (yes, 49, no, 7; N=56); more helpful to pupils with their school work (yes, 49, no, 8; N=57); more willing to "listen to pupils" (yes, 51, no, 6; N=57); more willing to help pupils with "personal problems" (yes, 50, no, 7; N=57); more understanding than mainstream staff (yes, 52, no, 5; N=57); and "less bossy" than mainstream staff (yes, 40, no, 11; N=51).

These findings give very strong support to the notion that pupils share very positive relationships with staff; that they feel themselves to be valued by staff, and that they hold the staff in high regard. This also points to a powerful contrast between the pupils' mainstream school and present experience (cf. Schostak, 1983; Tattum, 1982; Kronk, 1987).

Hypothesis 3 (Questions 14-22)

Responses to these questions support the contention that pupil success in these two schools is not seen by the pupils as being defined in narrow academic terms, but that social and personal development are also seen to be of major importance. Behaviour is considered to be of greater significance than schoolwork in both schools (yes, 38, no, 17; N=55). Furthermore, the quality of pupils' relationships with peers and staff is seen as a vital pre-requisite of doing well (yes, 94, no, 20; N=114 - response to q.18 and 19 combined). Doing well in school work as well as

"jobs" is an important recipe for success according to both sets of pupils (yes, 82, no, 31; N=113). School work, however, is still considered to be of importance to "doing well" (yes, 41, no, 15).

The overwhelming response to question 17, reveals that the vast majority of pupils "want to do well here" (yes, 53, no, 2), shows that pupils care about their progress, and indicates that they support the schools' values.

The only area of disagreement between the two pupil groups relates to the popularity of "jobs" in the two schools. Replies to the proposition: "This school is better than ordinary schools because pupils do jobs here", indicates an endorsement from the Farfield boys (yes, 22, no, 11; N=33), but a negative response from the Lakeside sample (yes, 10, no, 13; N=23). Whilst neither sample of pupils offers overwhelming support for this statement, the difference might be explained in terms of the greater burden of maintenance tasks that the Lakeside boys have to shoulder owing to the financial difficulties of the school; at Farfield some jobs are seen as privileges in themselves. This does nothing to diminish the view that such tasks are a valued means of "doing well" at the two schools.

In addition to the stress pupils place on interpersonal relationships in the schools, "trust" (q.20) is identified as an important quality, 52 pupils see trust as an important pre-requisite of "doing well", only 5 disagree with this view (N=57).

Hypothesis 4 (questions 23-26)

Items in this section relate to the negative effects of the two schools. The majority of pupils from both schools believe that people outside the school think that it is "a place for bad or strange people" (yes, 37, no, 20; N=57). A majority feel that it is a negative effect of the school that they do not see their families often enough (yes, 37, no, 20; N=57), and that "losing touch with" home based friends is another negative effect (yes, 41, no, 15; N=56). These findings support the hypothesis, and reflect the interview findings. However, as in the interview findings, it is found that many pupils also value the respite from home conditions that the residential school provides: having a "break from home" is felt to be a positive feature of the schools (yes, 34, no, 21; N=55).

It can be concluded, therefore, that the major inferences drawn from the interviews with pupils in the two fieldwork institutions, are supported by the findings of these two questionnaires. It is the writer's intention in the following chapter to explore some of the observational data in the light of these findings, in order to elicit the contribution made by the material environment to the pupils' experience.

CHAPTER SEVEN

MATERIAL RESOURCES IN THE FIELDWORK INSTITUTIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to highlight and explore some of the implications which emerge from a comparative analysis of the material aspects of the two schools. Emphasis in this chapter will be given to certain physical and organizational aspects of the schools, and the implications which such features may have for the quality of pupil experience. This chapter will tend to draw on observational data, rather than that supplied by the interviews. Analysis of the pupils' perspective will take place in the following chapters.

Lakeside and Farfield share many characteristics, in terms of their physical and organizational make up, as well as the philosophical orientations of their management staff. Both schools provide boarding and educational facilities for boys only, and take no day pupils. All pupils, in both schools, are financed by local education authorities, and have been statemented under the terms of the 1981 Education Act, as having special educational needs. All pupils in both schools are considered by the referring agencies to present emotional and behavioural difficulties, a small number of the boys at Farfield are considered to present moderate learning difficulties, also. Many pupils, in both schools, also appear to have family difficulties, which are considered to contribute to their need

for boarding provision; many of these pupils are placed in the care of their local authorities. Both schools are housed in large former manor houses, set in their own grounds, and in sparsely populated rural areas. Both schools have a separate "teaching block", which is set clearly apart from the "house" accommodation, where the formal educational element of the residential programme takes place. Management in both schools express a commitment to a therapeutic approach to emotional, behavioural and learning difficulties, but also broaden this into a more eclectic approach. Both schools take pupils from predominantly within the secondary age range, and, consequently, seek to reflect something of the mainstream comprehensive curriculum into their educational programmes. Both schools operate a subject based curriculum, with teachers offering particular specialisms, in addition to their generalist class teacher roles. There is a fairly rigid distinction between "teachers" and "care staff" in both schools. Care staff take the major responsibility for the supervision of pupils outside lesson time, and deal with family and outside agency liaison. Teachers are also involved in these areas of school life, only to a lesser extent. In addition to full time teaching commitments, teachers in both schools undertake "extraneous duties", which involves working alongside care staff during out of school time, and for which additional salary payments are made.

In terms of the physical character and location of the schools, the age and designation of the pupil groups, and the general approach to the care and education of their pupils, these schools can be said to conform to what Cole (1986) describes as the "orthodox" pattern of special boarding schools to be found on the British mainland. According to Cole,

66% of special boarding schools cater for ESN(M) or EBD pupils, in rural locations, and have an approximate average of 40 pupils on roll. Often in such schools no single philosophy or approach is rigidly adhered to, and staff tend to:

[...] view theory with scepticism until it has been widely proved to working practice. Staff are pragmatic and eclectic in approach, having a healthy respect for well established traditions. (p.53)

These schools also tend to have an academic, subject based curriculum (Wilson and Evans, 1980).

A more distinctive feature shared by Farfield and Lakeside is the fact that they are "independent" schools. Slightly less than half of the total number of pupils stated as having emotional and behavioural problems (or "maladjusted") were placed by LEA's in independent school in 1983 (DES, 1983). The financial arrangements of any school are significant, in that they often imply particular constraints and possibilities which inevitably effect the material quality of provision. The head master of Lakeside claimed that the school's status as a charitable trust, entailed an obligation to maintain the school fees at a relatively low level, in fact, he claimed them to be among the lowest fees available for such a school at the time of the study. This low level of income led to a relatively spartan environment, which lacked the facilities of wealthier schools. This relatively unattractive environment, therefore, affected the popularity of the school to the extent that the school carried 8 pupil vacancies at the time of the study. Farfield on the other hand, is run on a profit making basis, with the principal as co-owner. In contrast

to Lakeside, Farfield was sufficiently popular among referring agencies, according to the principal, to need to operate a waiting list for prospective pupils. The principal attributed this success to the fact that the school offered 52 week a year placement facilities..

The financial differences between the two schools were reflected in a number of ways. Most obvious of these to the visitor to the schools, are the differences in physical appearance, and general state of repair, between the two schools. The visitor's first impression of Farfield was one of its neatly kept lawns and flower beds. The white rendered external walls of the main "house" were also clean and well maintained, as was the well swept tarmacadam car park which formed a forecourt to the main building. At various points around the grounds were hanging baskets, well stocked and cared for. The teaching buildings, which were partly screened by well established trees and shrubs, were uniformly of a "portacabin" type construction, externally tidy and clean. By way of contrast, Lakeside presented a more "down at heel" image to the visitor. The main building was approached by a long, upwardly sloping, circuitous and potholed drive, covered in loose stones. The unkempt shrubbery which flanked and encroached onto the drive had a darkening and enclosing effect. The lawns, flower beds and garden walls were rough and ragged. The tall, gothic, grey stone building which dominated the school site, gave a general air of gloom and neglect, with one or two boarded up broken window panes. The other buildings on the Lakeside site were a motly collection of sheds, prefabricated structures and brick outhouses. All of these buildings could be described, most kindly, as having the appearance of being well used, or, not so kindly, as unkempt.

These contrasts in the external features of the buildings were carried through into their interiors also. The entrance hall at Farfield, was instantly bright and inviting. This was partly owing to the ample abundance of large windows, but was also attributable to bright and well maintained decor. There were good quality carpets fitted throughout the house, and a homely atmosphere was created by the generous provision of cut flowers. On the walls were many pictures, both scenic prints and mounted photographs of staff and pupils in informal poses. Lakeside's interior made a less favourable impression on the visitor. The large, windowless entrance hall was ill lit and gloomy. The gloom was alleviated slightly by the whole wall being given over to a notice board containing posters advertizing school events and containing photographs of staff and pupils on an outing. The decor and furnishings were in need of renovation in many areas.

The dining rooms in the two schools also contrasted in important ways. At Farfield it was carpeted and wall papered. Pupils were seated in groups of 4 around small tables with table cloths. Meals were served on plates through a serving hatch. At Lakeside the dining room had a more institutiona appearance. Large formica topped tables were ranged in two straight rows forming a wide aisle down the centre of the room. Tables sat between 6 and 8 persons. The food was served from a large metal trolley.

Sleeping accommodation in both schools was attractive. At Farfield rooms were comfortably carpeted and wall papered; at Lakeside they were painted and carpeted. Pupils in both schools were encouraged to decorate their own areas with posters and other personal possessions. At

Lakeside this personalization extended to the choice and application of colour schemes by pupils. Washing and bathing facilities in both schools were kept scrupulously clean, and a relatively high level of privacy was available in both schools, for bathing and toileting. Though both schools, in addition to bathrooms, had communal shower blocks, and at Farfield all pupils had to take compulsory communal showers on a weekly basis.

Farfield was also far better resourced in terms of recreational; and leisure equipment, having 3 mini-buses, a school car, a small well stocked gymnasium and an outdoor swimming pool housed in an inflatable covering for use in inclement weather. Lakeside, by contrast, was very limited in these areas, having only one mini-bus, and very little good quality recreational equipment. They did have several canoes, however, which had been built by staff and pupils.

On the face of it, the better financial resources possessed by Farfield, led to the creation of a more homely and inviting environment for its pupils. The importance of the physical provision in such schools is noted by Cole (1986):

Good schools tend to be bright, cheerfully decorated places where there is clear evidence that staff make an effort to look after the fabric. (p.102)

Wilson and Evans (1980) also state:

It matters that the outside and inside of the buildings and the grounds should be as well maintained as possible. Although children may not seem to notice dirt and disrepair the effects are shown in the amount of vandalism which occurs in poorly maintained premises. Even very disturbed children show more care when places are attractively decorated [...] (p.190)

The importance of the total environment in the treatment of disturbed pupils is noted by Bettelheim (1950, 1955). He suggests that orderliness and cleanliness within such schools should be "maintained to be fully compatible with comfort" (1955, p.25). The physical aspect of the buildings and rooms within provide an essential source of satisfaction on which the "ego strengthening" process, which is a central purpose of such schools is built. Furthermore, that the quality of such provision should be high is underlined by Rose (1978), who, in describing his work at Peper Harrow school, claims to demand only the very best of available resources for the school. This is to provide pupils with a sense of being valued, as well as to create a setting in which pupils who are trying to learn new patterns of behaviour are not reminded of the circumstances which created their negative feelings and behaviour, in the form of unsatisfactory caring arrangements which may have existed in their home situations as a result of poverty or neglect. Bettelheim and Rose both insist that the therapeutic setting must dispel from pupils all fears of neglect or rejection by showing pupils that their comfort and wellbeing are considered of great importance. Rose suggests that a "total" care can only be provided in:

A residential institution that really does regard its bathrooms and lavatories as at least of equal importance to its examination results [...] (p.4)

The link between toileting and feeding as being central to the primary experiences of individuals is particularly important to those, such as Bettelheim and Rose, pursuing a psychodynamic approach, but from a more sociological viewpoint, as Bettelheim (1955) suggests, mealtimes can be a major part of the socialization process, in which sharing and consideration

for others are symbolically and physically enacted in the processes of presenting and consuming food.

The higher incidence of vandalism reported by pupils at Lakeside might well be taken as support for the claims of Wilson and Evans, reported above, in spite of the pupils' view that this was attributable to a relaxation in the "strictness" of staff. However, it would seem from the interview data that Lakeside, whilst offering relatively poor physical provision (though cleanliness is highly evident at the school) provides pupils with experiences that engender a sense of self esteem, like that required by Bettelheim and Rose. Although it is partly out of financial necessity that pupils and staff engage in routine maintenance work at the school, these activities clearly contribute to pupils' positive views of staff, as well as their views of their own competence and capabilities. Pupils are proud to show to visitors examples of their own and other boys' craftsmanship. Although some of this work may appear to be crude to the visitor, it is to the pupils a symbol of achievement, and of the pupils' involvement and value to the community. Wilson and Evans (1980) make an observation on this matter:

Some authorities are reluctant to allow pupils to redecorate their accommodation with the help of staff, to help in the upkeep of the buildings or to repair wilful damage. This is understandable as authorities would not wish to be criticized for using children for tasks which would normally be undertaken by appropriate adult workers. However, this seems a pity as pupils can get considerable satisfaction from making tangible contributions of this kind and can learn valuable skills in the process. (p. 191)

Bettelheim (1955) also describes the development of "proprietary feelings" towards the institution in children whose rehabilitation is in progress. This takes the form of the voluntary performance of "a few household tasks" (p.25). Bettelheim stresses the need for this to be voluntary, and sees it only as a by product rather than a vehicle of therapy. Wills, on the other hand, saw such involvement as a major therapeutic tool. In one of his early "experiments" with young offenders (Wills, 1941), aged 14 and upwards, staff and inmates lived in tents until they had collaboratively constructed the buildings in which they were to subsequently live. This was an early example of Wills's exploration of the concept and practice of "shared responsibility". Closer to the Lakeside example was the system operated by Balbernie at The Cotswold Community, and reported by Wills (1971). Wills describes one area of the community where:

[the boys] spend part of their time [...] doing decorative painting and lettering (those of them who feel so disposed) and part of their time about the place doing necessary but non-urgent jobs of house-painting. This is done as and when the instructor thinks it will be useful to the boys. If it is something that must be done *now*, then it is done by maintenance staff or outside contractors. (p.108)

A.S. Neill also undertook a great deal of maintenance work at Summerhill, and whilst he would not compel staff and pupils to help him he complained at group meetings that their failure to help was a sign of poor community spirit (Croall, 1983). Bridgeland (1971) describes the importance of manual labour at The Little Commonwealth, the school run by Homer Lane, whom Brideland describes as the "archetypal" pioneer in this field:

Apart from the experience of shared responsibility, the therapy was largely that of hard manual labour.
[...]

[Lane emphasised] the educational benefits of craftsmanship and manual labour in encouraging independence and self reliance, appreciation and taste, attention and perseverance. (pp.100-102)

Lennhoff (1966) describes how boys at Shotton Hall School gained increased self confidence and sense of self worth from work tasks of this type (p.91).

At Lakeside the maintenance work provides a focus to the life of the community. It is as much a part of the daily routine of the school as going to classes. Of particular importance, however, is the fact that it is an experience which is shared by staff as well as pupils; from the head master downwards, everyone has "jobs" to do. This is one of the points made by a pupil who describes the staff at Lakeside as more "flexible" than mainstream teachers. He cites the experience of seeing a teacher "unblock a drain" as an example of this. The jobs also become a focus of some group and unit meetings, giving pupils opportunities to engage in the active - process of discussion and decision making about matters which affect they daily lives. Another important effect of this use of "jobs" is described by Vills (1971), in his discussion of The Cotswold Community:

[...] the gradual erosion of the mortifying conception of work as a burden to be avoided if humanly possible. (p.109)

Compare this with Arthur's statement (from the Lakeside study):

[...] I just got used to doing it ["jobs"], and it's worth it. It just comes natural. So that when you leave school you just think, Oh, work - it's just natural. (Chapter, 5, Section 7)

Stan (Lakeside) is also convinced of the therapeutic value of "jobs":

I'm more confident in myself. Being able to do things I never thought I could do. Like last weekend, me and another boy, our job was the front drive. There's me and him went off, quite happy, and filled up some potholes. I'd never have thought of doing that before, or known how to do it. I've learnt to do quite a few different things. Yes, you learn things and how to do them properly. (Chapter 5, section 7)

This would suggest that financial status is not necessarily an indication of a degree of therapeutic success. Whilst material provision offers many important advantages, there are important gains to be made from treating the lack of financial support as a community problem to be solved by the community. This view is also consistent with the different views aired by pupils in the two schools about rule making: Lakeside pupils felt themselves to have some influence over rule making, whilst the Farfield boys felt they had no influence in this area.

An important area where economic factors are of paramount importance, however, is that of staffing. Below is a table comparing the staffing levels in the two schools (TableXX). Clearly, when staff levels in the two schools are compared on the basis of a full complement of pupils, Farfield has a superior staff-pupil ratio on the education side, as well as in terms of ancilliary staff. Lakeside, however, can be seen to have a superior staff-pupil ratio on the care side. Closer examination, however, reveals differences in the nature of the staff groups, with implications for the provision made. The larger number of teaching staff permits a greater flexibility in grouping and timetabling. There are 6 teaching groups at Farfield, with an average of 7.5 boys in a group. The head master at Lakeside does not undertake teaching duties, this leaves the

remaining 4 staff with a group each, with an average of 7.5 boys to a group (10 to a group, when the roll is at its maximum).

TABLE XX
COMPARING THE STAFFING LEVELS OF THE FIELDWORK SCHOOLS

Type of staff	numbers of staff	
	FARFIELD	LAKESIDE
Teachers (full-time)	7	5
Teachers (part-time)	4 = 1.6	0.5
Total number of Teachers (full-time)	8.6	5.5
Teacher-pupil ratio	1:5.2	1:5.8 (1:7.2) (Full roll)
RSV'S (full-time)	8	8
RSV's (part-time)	0.5	-
Total number of RSV's	8.5	8
RSV-pupil ratio (inc. days off)	1:6.4	1:3.5 (1:5.7) (Full roll)
Matron	-	1
Ancilliary Staff:		
Secretary	1	1
Cleaners (part-time)	4	3
Cook	1	1
Kitchen assistant	1	1
Seamstress	1	1
Laundry assistant	-	1
Handymen/gardeners	2	-
Total number of ancillaries	10	8

The tightness of the staffing at Lakeside does not allow teachers non-contact time for marking and preparation, whilst their Farfield counterparts have 6 non contact periods (35 or 40 minutes each) per week. Furthermore, the larger number of teachers at Farfield are able to offer specialist teaching in a number of subjects. At Farfield part-time

specialist staff are employed to teach science, remedial maths., remedial English, and Art and Craft. The Farfield teachers' main specialisms are: English, 3 P.E. specialists, 2 woodwork specialists, and a rural science specialist. Lakeside has a half time remedial specialist. The specialisms of the class teachers are English, 2 art specialists and a social studies specialist.

A comparison between numbers of care staff in the schools shows Lakeside to have a much larger complement of RSW's. There are, however, striking differences between the two staff groups, in terms of training, pay and duties performed. All of the care staff at Lakeside were under 30, and the vast majority under 25. Only the head of care had any professional qualifications (CQSW) of any kind. All of the staff, except the head of care, were paid on grade 1 of the NUJ Residential Social Workers' Scale (£4,281 - £6,078). The Lakeside residential staff had to carry out routine maintenance tasks around the school, and 2 were in fact on duty during the hours when pupils were at school to do just this. Both the head master and the head of care expressed the opinion that the care staff were overworked and underpaid, and that their lack of professional training and experience of child care hampered their performance. It was universally stated by RSW's and senior staff that these problems were exacerbated by the total lack of inservice training for care staff. Thus the head of care described his role as involving the training of "these raw recruits". The care staff at Farfield contrast in many ways to their Lakeside counterparts. In terms of age range, the youngest was 27, only 2 other RSW's were under 30. One other RSW was between 30 and 35. The remaining, the other 5 RSW's were between 40 and 50. The youngest RSW was without professional

qualifications, but held an Open University degree in Social Sciences; he was paid at the grade 2 level. The remaining basic grade RSW's were paid at grade 3 level (£6,900 - £8154); one senior RSW was paid at grade 4 level (£7,920 - £9,282). In addition there was a head of care (also the principal) and deputy head of care (the wife of the principal), whose salary levels were not made available to the researcher. All of the grade 3 RSW's had professional qualifications, (4 of them were qualified teachers, one a qualified residential social worker, and the grade 4 RSW was also a qualified teacher. The principal held a non graduate qualification in child care. The deputy head of care was also unqualified. All of the RSW's were employed exclusively to undertake child care duties. They were also contracted to attend annual in service training courses. During the period of the research 4 RSW's and one teacher attended residential training courses organized by the National Children's Homes and the Social care Association. In both schools the teachers were paid according to Burnham rates (ie. nationally agreed salaries for teachers in state schools) and received an "extraneous duties allowance", for child care duties (15 hours per week at Lakeside, and 10 hours per week at Farfield, with rates adjusted accordingly).

It must be stressed that the differences that we have observed between the two schools, in terms of resource allocation, staffing, staff pay and training, are not, in themselves indicative of any qualitative differences between the schools. It seems to be agreed by a wide range of authorities that the qualities most sought in workers with disturbed children tend to reside in matters of attitude and personality, rather than in academic or professional qualifications, or experience (Wills, 1960;

Wilson and Evans, 1980; Croall, 1983; Cole, 1986). There are, however, particular implications which follow from the differences in staff training and career structure that exist in these schools. Handy (1981) describes three areas which organizations need to consider for the successful management of their human "assets". These are: Appraisal Schemes, Career Planning, and Compensation Systems. Successful management of these areas, Handy claims, contribute to the overall success of the organization by insuring the willing compliance of members. All three of these features have implications for the allocation of resources. Both schools had a staff appraisal system. At Farfield both RSW's and teachers were appraised by senior colleagues in their own discipline. At Lakeside only RSW's were appraised in regular "supervision" sessions. These sessions, in both schools were claimed by management to provide workers with feedback and guidance on their fulfilment of their duties. However, desirable outcomes of such sessions, described by Handy in terms of career planning and compensation systems, which provide workers with a sense of professional progress and support, were only made available to Farfield workers through the provision of additional training, and opportunities for promotion; financial restrictions at Lakeside prevented this from happening there. These problems might also be seen to be reflected in the relative high turnover of care staff at Lakeside: the longest serving RSW having been there for 9 months. At Farfield the RSW's had served between 2 and 5 years. The head of care at Lakeside described the paradox of his situation being that the best advice he could offer to a promising care worker was to leave Lakeside to take up professional training.

Whilst low income and lack of training opportunities are not measures of the quality of an organization's work, they clearly contribute to what have been identified as feelings of "low status and marginality" experienced by some RSW's (Cole, 1986, p.126). Feelings underlined by the relatively better pay of their teacher colleagues. At Farfield this differential was much narrower, and teachers and care staff shared equal status. At Lakeside teachers were always seen as being "senior" to care staff during "extraneous duties", when the rota placed them over care staff in a supervisory role.

The need for RSW's to receive adequate, certified training is recognized in the Warnock Report (HMSO, 1978), not only as a means of providing them with a practical and theoretical basis for their work, but also as a means of providing them with professional status and a career structure. Such a status change, it is argued will lead to greater stability in this occupational group by making it a potentially life long career. The greater stability of the Farfield group would seem to support this contention. A further advantage of such a career structure is that it would encourage workers to form associations with their professional colleagues in other institutions, as a means of promoting their common interests and of sharing expertise and knowledge (Wilson and Evans, 1980). Greater stability and professional knowledge can only benefit the children in a residential environment, for whom transient and unpredictable human relationships can often be a pattern of expectation which hinders their positive development.

This chapter has tended to dwell on the major differences which can be observed between Farfield and Lakeside. These differences have been seen to be of an organizational and material nature. Much attention has been drawn to the relative poverty of Lakeside, which is reflected, chiefly, in the provision of resources and recruitment and functioning of staff. It was suggested that staff at Lakeside have greater demands made on their time and energy, and the care staff in particular, have less opportunity for professional advancement than their Farfield counterparts, as a result of limitations in resources. These factors might well be seen as contributing to the high turnover of staff at Lakeside. An earlier chapter has shown, however, that there are other reasons also, for this situation. Furthermore, whilst the material provision at Farfield is seen by the pupils as a source of satisfaction in their school lives, the obvious lack of such provision at Lakeside is not, as one might expect, a corresponding cause of dissatisfaction among pupils. In fact, the organizational response to a lack of financial resources, and the way in which this is incorporated into the day to day life of the community, provides some Lakeside boys with sources of satisfaction that are denied their Farfield counterparts. It would seem, therefore, that whilst important implications arise from questions of resources, the effects of diminished resources are not recognized by pupils as being of major negative significance. This might be partly owing to the fact that Lakeside pupils were only term time boarders, whilst Farfield set out to make provision for 52 week placements, situations which may give rise to very different expectations in this sense.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE QUALITY OF THE RESIDENTIAL EXPERIENCE

The following chapter will present an analysis of the residential experience as it has been revealed in the present study. Analytical points raised already, in chapters 4 and 7 will be drawn together and incorporated into a more thorough analysis of the the major findings of the study. In order to do this the chapter has been divided in to two sub-sections. The first sub-section deals with the question of "institutionalization", which was raised in the introduction to this thesis and which was discussed in relation to the first case study (chapter 4). The second sub-section will be devoted to an analysis of those areas of residential school life that the pupils at the centre of this study identified as being of significance to them. It is argued that herein lie the some of the most important, hitherto uncharted, effects of the residential experience, for it is here that we have observed at first hand the nature and extent of the schools' impingement on the personal worlds of these boys.

(1) *The Schools as Total Institutions*

It was noted that there was evidence, in the pupils' perceptions of their situation, of certain of the "deprivations" noted by Goffman (1961) as being characteristic of total institutions. It was noted, in particular, that the pupils at Farfield described situations and events which could be interpreted as "curtailments of self". These are events initiated by the institution in order to underline the inmates' separation from the outside world, and their subjugation to rules and norms of the institution that may contravene inmates' basic rights as free citizens in the society outside the institution. Like their Farfield counterparts, the Lakeside boys describe their initial responses to school in, often, negative terms, emphasising its alien nature to them. It was not uncommon for pupils to wish to leave the school at first. Reasons given for these feelings included fears for personal safety and dislike of particular compulsory aspects of school life, such as the demand on all pupils to do "jobs" (Arthur, Lakeside, section 1). Stan's description of his reluctance to venture beyond the "bottom of the [school] drive" on the first day (Lakeside, section 1), underlines the feelings of fear and alienation which can be aroused by the anticipation of life in a residential special school. Also, for Stan, who had been a persistent truant from a comprehensive school, crossing the frontier between Lakeside and the outside world, meant he could no longer exercise personal discretion in the choice of whether or not he went to school. Other "curtailments of self" experienced by Lakeside boys were: enforced bedtimes, lack of personal privacy, and lack of freedom of movement in and

out of school premises. Frank sums up the lack of privacy and freedom graphically:

The only bit of freedom you get is Saturday afternoon [...]
All the rest of the time you're supervised, apart from when
you're having a bath, on the toilet or asleep. That's the only
time you're not supervised. (section 2)

Frank and Tim also point out that when they are at home with their families they enjoy something closer to adult status, in that they are able to stay out late and go to "pubs and [night] clubs", whilst at Lakeside they are only permitted the status of children, in that they must attend youth clubs and drink only "coke" (section 2).

There is then ample evidence from these two studies to support the contention that for some pupils in both schools the residential experience contains experiences which they interpret as violations of their perceived rights. Areas of their lives which are relatively free from external regulation outside the school, become the subject of institutional control with the jurisdiction of the schools. The fact that truancy and the consumption of alcohol by juveniles are illegal acts, and are prohibited by law, does not diminish the effect of this denial of customary freedom. The imposition of compulsory work tasks, however, has no legal support, and would appear to associate closely with Goffman's category of "forced labour", which is an imposition that might well be construed as an illegal act in the "outside world", especially where children are involved. However, the "forced labour" is not only inflicted on the pupils, the work tasks are allotted to both staff and pupils. Because of this, the compulsory work tasks formed a part of the shared experience of school

life, engaged in by all the participants. Far from being a sign of one group's dominance over another, "jobs" can be seen as a status leveller, giving pupils the opportunity to see teachers and other staff in a more human light, as is shown by Lakeside boys' references to the greater "flexibility" of teachers at Lakeside, and Arthur's claim that they are "more like people" (Lakeside, section 3). In addition to this the experience of tackling jobs successfully has been shown to be, for some children, a confidence building exercise (section 7).

A less defensible form of "defilement" described by pupils in both schools, is the deprivation they suffer in terms of domestic freedom. In both schools pupils complained of their limited access to the school kitchen. An example cited by pupils from both schools is the way in which making a cup of coffee is a taken for granted right at home but a privilege at school. Smoking restrictions are also relevant here. The restriction on access to the kitchen is of fundamental significance in that it would seem to undermine the image of the school as a home for the children. They believe that freedom of access to the larder is a taken for granted right in a normal family home. The withdrawal of this right leads to resentment at their demotion to a passive status. Goffman claims that encouragement of such docility leads to social incompetence among long stay patients in psychiatric hospitals. Of particular relevance here is the fact that the erection of such a physical barrier as a locked door, access through which is controlled by staff, not only undermines the homeliness of the shared living space, but also underlines the status difference between staff and pupils; emphasising a control rather than care function.

Cole (1986) describes the way in which such an underlining of authority relations can be avoided in those schools which adopt the "Family Group" or "Federal" approaches. In such schools the pupil population is divided into small living units, closer in size to a natural family group, where:

As a family house, the interior of the building will be divided into small, homely rooms. There is likely to be a comfortable living room, carpeted and with easy chairs. There will be a bedroom for two or three children, not dormitories for a dozen or more. The children will have free access to a warm, inviting kitchen, often seen as the heart of the house. Here counselling can take place as child and housemother make cups of coffee together. In contrast to Barnardo's barrack-style establishment, the building will not be clearly divided between staff and children's 'space'. (p.51)

Cole's view is both idealized in its description of family group and federal systems, as well as unjust and outdated in its remarks about Barnardo's facilities (see Maybin et al., 1984, for a description of a Barnardo's project employing family sized units for "troubled children" and their families). However, Cole's claim that systems in which the "blurring of physical boundaries" is reflected in the "blurring of emotional and social boundaries", have therapeutic benefits for their children, seems sound. This point is supported by Rose (1978), who makes a particular reference to the need for the availability of food to children at all times. Bettelheim (1950) describes how "early deprivation" of food can often be linked to delinquency - particularly stealing - in later life, and how its "ample abundance" in the residential setting is of particular therapeutic significance (pp.174-175). The linking of access to feeding opportunities with authority relationships also brings in the views shared by many of the pioneer workers of residential work with disturbed children.

They strongly advocated the need for pupils to be permitted "freedom of expression" and the right of "self government" (Dawson, 1981). These two tenets are incompatible with the sort of restrictive practice implied by the locking of the kitchen door. This aspect of the two fieldwork schools, then, would seem to represent a negative effect of institutionalization in the form of a genuine "defilement".

The symbolic, as opposed to the simply physical, function of food, as a means of communication between individuals is not only recognized by theorists and practitioners (Bettelheim, 1950; Rose, 1978; Cole, 1986), but also by some of the pupils in the present study. They are acutely aware of the status implications of this form of deprivation. Another closely related area of symbolism is that concerning smoking. Smoking, it has been suggested can be seen as serving as a form of cultural identification among certain groups of school pupils. Hargreaves (1967), Willis (1978) and Davies (1984), each observe a link between smoking and disaffection from school. All three writers see smoking as a symbolic act of group resistance against the official culture of the school. The act of smoking not only restates a sense of group solidarity and shared opposition, but is also a public identification with adult working class culture (Willis, 1978). Bearing in mind this perspective, and the fact that the right of juveniles to smoke is by no means universally recognized, even among the parents of these boys, it is surprising that the two schools permit smoking at all. The granting of such permission can be seen less in terms of a "curtailment of self", than as an official recognition by the schools of the validity of pupils' cultural values.

The complexities which surround the pupils' smoking habits in the two schools reveal two apparently contradictory facets of the schools. From a Goffmanesque standpoint we would expect the schools to prohibit smoking among pupils, firstly, because of the administrative inconvenience created by the practice (ie. distribution, monitoring and accommodation), secondly, because of safety factors (ie. fire, physical injury, smoking related illnesses), and finally because of its cultural associations (anti-school, delinquent). Both schools, however, permit smoking to take place in designated places, notable for their discomfort (the "boot room" at Farfield; the "shed" at Lakeside). In both schools, however, there is a high degree of staff discretion operated in this area, and pupils are sometimes observed smoking, with staff permission, in non-designated areas. This highly valued privilege can also be seen to conceal a subtle control mechanism. By assimilating this aspect of pupil culture into the official organization of the school, it becomes subject to control and regulation by the upper echelon (ie. the staff). This point is underlined by the fact that the right to smoke is conditional upon pupils handing over all smoking materials to the staff, who distribute them to pupils in set quantities and at set times. Whilst at Lakeside pupils bought their own materials if they wished to smoke, at Farfield cigarettes were bought in bulk on behalf of the pupils by the school and distributed to pupils by staff, who deducted the cost of the cigarettes from the pupils' pocket money. By assuming control over the holding and distribution of cigarettes, staff could and did use the banning of smoking as a threat and punishment, and the offer of extra cigarettes or smoking opportunities as an incentive and reward. In this sense the institutional regulations surrounding smoking in the two schools, can be seen to make the process a form of "curtailment". A truly

rebellious pupil response to such a situation (which was not observed in this study) would have been for pupils to *refuse to smoke* on school premises.

The purpose of this lengthy exploration of the significance of smoking is to illustrate the way in which the type of institutional control exerted in the fieldwork schools differs from that described by Goffman. Whilst administrative benefits do emerge from the way in which smoking is controlled in the schools (ie. as a social control mechanism, and a means of minimizing illicit, potentially hazardous illicit smoking), the pupils themselves also benefit from this situation, in that they receive greater recognition of their own cultural identities by being granted a right that would be denied them in a mainstream school. This contrasts directly with Goffman's concept of the "disculturation" of inmates, whereby total institutions are said to deprive their inmates of their cultural identities, by preventing them from engaging in activities associated with their out of institution culture. In this circumstance the two schools attempt to assimilate something of the pupils' culture.

The "privilege system" is another feature, described by Goffman as involving "the absence of deprivation", which is evident in the fieldwork schools. There is a sense from pupils in both schools that the so-called privileges that are granted by the schools are trivial. Later bedtimes, permission to prepare drinks in the school kitchen, permission to leave the school unaccompanied or, more often, accompanied, and the extension of smoking privileges, are all cited as somewhat trivial privileges, made significant only by their scarcity.

It has been shown that Lakeside school had a far more formalized privilege system than was in operation than at Fairfield. The details of the "helpers' list" have already been fully described (Lakeside, section 2). Helpers were a small group of pupils, selected on a weekly basis, who were said to have made outstanding progress socially and academically. They were rewarded with a small additional amount of pocket money, later bedtimes and a weekly "helpers' treat", such as a trip to the cinema or other special event not normally made available to pupils. The extent to which the effectiveness of the privilege system depended upon the existence of deprivation, however, is clearly demonstrated by the attitudes of the pupils to the introduction of the "helper'" scheme and the abolition of the former privilege system, known as the "leaders' list". Several pupils commented that they felt less motivated by the new privilege system, because owing to a general relaxation in the rules of the school, all pupils now enjoyed a higher level of comfort than they had under the previous regime. Aspects of the life of the school which had formerly been seen as privileges had now become more freely available to all pupils. This involved the relaxation of rules relating to bedtimes and freedom of movement outside the school. The most sadly missed aspect of the old regime was the leaders' role as surrogate staff members; a position of some authority and considerable status among the pupil group. Pupils in both schools commented on what they saw as a liberalization in the school regime, which had occurred during their stay at the school. It was, however, only the Lakeside boys who found in this liberalization grounds for complaint; Fairfield boys welcomed the changes. This difference may be owing to the differences in the privilege systems of the schools. The Lakeside system seemed to work with much greater rigidity and formality

than the Farfield system. At the latter school privileges were conferred, but not in accordance with any clearly laid down procedure. A rigid system, such as that in operation at Lakeside, lays down correspondingly rigid expectations in the minds of the pupils; the dilution of those privileges, therefore, is not only immediately obvious, but also a bitter disappointment. At Farfield pupils' expectations were generally vague, and the former regime was not associated with a particular privilege system. The relaxation in the rigidity of the regime was, therefore, itself seen largely in terms of the benefits it brought to everyone, rather than as a loss of any kind. The less institutionalized and more personal approach to privilege conferment at Farfield, can, because of these outcomes, be seen as a more effective management tool. Whilst the bureaucratic formalism of the Lakeside model seems to have been something of a two edged sword, seen by the pupils as a rule system to which pupils and staff had to adhere, rooted in supposed objectivity rather than personal preferment.

Another feature shared by the pupils of the two schools was their almost universal tendency towards modes of adaptation to their school systems which tended towards positive and active involvement rather than passive and docile involvement. The nearest approximation to these forms of adaptation in Goffman's study is the form of adaptation he refers to as "colonization". Goffman's use of the term is intended to describe the way in which for the inmate certain aspects of the institution, and in particular those which involve "sampling of the outside world", become central preoccupations on the basis of which a generally contented existence is built. Goffman presents this as a passive form of adaptation, in that it rests on the inmate's acceptance of what the institution has to

offer, and his making the best of this. We saw this form of adaptation demonstrated by pupils from both schools. It is best summed up in terms of the way in which some pupils are seen to stress only the positive aspects of certain institutional features, without appearing to recognize the deprivations which they entail. This is exemplified by Colin's delight at the quality of the "trips out" at Farfield, without an obvious recognition of the restrictions placed on these events as a result of the group nature of such visits and their limitations dictated by school timetables and staff disposition and availability (Farfield, section 2). Another example is provided by the Lakeside pupils' acceptance and co-operation with the "Leaders" system, which, as we have shown, depended for its success on a generally high level of restriction and deprivation. The pupils' general compliance with smoking rules in the two schools is also representative of this mode of adaptation. The present study also found that some pupils took this mode of adaptation a stage further than this; their form of adaptation is perhaps best described as "manipulative colonization". This manifested itself in the ways in which certain boys consciously manipulated circumstances in order to maximize their personal comfort, whilst, at the same time, recognizing the deprivations which are involved in institutional life. Ryan demonstrated this mode of adaptation most clearly (Farfield, section 2), in his willingness to "take liberties" by making coffee for himself, and his involvement in laundry work which gave him legitimate cause for being excused from class.

The lack of evidence of the existence of the more extreme and negative forms of adaptation, "situational withdrawal" and "the intransigent line", seem to be consistent with the general attempts by the

schools to avoid "disculturation". Pupils were not pressurized to abandon their personal identities at the school gates. They were encouraged to personalize their living spaces, and to develop personal talents and skills. At Lakeside in particular, boys were encouraged to voice their opinions and have some involvement in decision making around the school; they were also constantly involved in the physical shaping of their environment through maintenance and construction "jobs". The quality of interpersonal relationships both between staff and boys, and among the boys, also contributed to positive forms of adaptation. It is through such relationships of mutual respect and trust that the self is constantly acknowledged and given opportunities for positive growth.

It is in this area of interpersonal relationships, and particularly staff-pupil relationships, that the present analysis parts company most clearly from that of Goffman. Central to Goffman's thesis is the notion that the organizational patterns within total institutions encourage staff to attribute to inmates "the same characteristics as inanimate objects" (p.73). More recent studies have shown that in many total institutions this effect can be seen to prevail. It has been seen in the long term hospitalization of the mentally handicapped of all ages (Ryan and Thomas, 1980; Shearer, 1980; Oswin, 1978), in the way in which patients become "objectified" by staff who see their duties in terms of "body servicing", ignoring the affective needs of patients, and so depriving younger patients of opportunities for positive social, emotional and intellectual development, and leading to the "disculturation" of older patients. Millham et al. (1977) detect similar tendencies in the worst of the English "approved schools" of their study; here the denial of inmates'

affective needs is an outcome of harsh and punitive regimes which deliberately restrict opportunities for the development of interpersonal relationships between staff and inmates, and minimize association between inmates. The mechanistic approach to the treatment of residential inmates, described by these writers, highlights many of the worst effects of total institutions described by Goffman. This approach has also been described by Miller and Gwynne (1972) as the "warehousing" approach to inmate care. In their study of residential provision for incurably ill adults, however, they also identified a more positive forms of care which they called the "horticultural" approach. This second approach is characterized by patterns of institutional organization which encourage staff to make the residential experience as positive and enriching as possible for patients. In such institutions the affective needs of inmates are seen to be paramount.

Miller and Gwynne's indication of a more positive form of residential organization helps to put the findings of the present study into a broader context. It highlights the conflict which has been seen to exist in many such institutions between care and control. What prevents Lakeside and Farfield from being the worst type of total institution is the way in which the "care" dimension is emphasised, not always in preference to the control dimension but often to an extent which softens the control function. Far from being "objectified" there is a sense in which many pupils escape unwanted and objectified identities, and are given opportunities to develop new identities which raise self-images, as a result of experiences they undergo at Lakeside and Farfield. Central to these experiences are the interpersonal relationships they share with

staff, and the opportunities the schools offer for pupils to make positive personal achievements. An analysis of the way in which these experiences are provided by the institutions in this study will be dealt with in the second part of this chapter.

It would be wrong at this point to simply dismiss those elements of the fieldwork schools which are identifiable as "defilements" in the Goffman sense. They remain flaws in the organizational patterns of the two schools which may well place limitations on the effectiveness of the schools as therapeutic environments. An important outcome of this analysis is, however, a recognition of the fact that the presence of certain of Goffman's defilements is not necessarily concomitant with the worst personal outcomes of total institutions. This point is perhaps most painfully underlined by some of the pupils' experiences of stigma when they return to their homes and meet friends and neighbours. It is suggested that the pupils' fear of stigma (whether they are genuinely stigmatized or simply imagine themselves to be) is in itself an outcome of the popular image of the total institution as a place for the incarceration of individuals who are, for various reasons, unfit to live in the open community. Goffman shows how such "unfitness" can be an outcome of the experience of being an inmate. Rosenhan (1973) shows how such unfitness (in the form of insanity) can be socially constructed simply on the basis of an individual having attended an institution of a certain type, though without anything other than a clandestine reason for so doing. Rosenhan found that when 8 "pseudopatients" gained admission to a psychiatric hospital by simply alleging the symptoms of mental illness, they were not detected as sane, in spite of their "public show of sanity" in the

hospital, and were in fact discharged with the diagnosis of mental illness "in remission". Once labelled as "mentally ill" the pseudopatients found it very difficult to escape the labels, in fact Rosenhan demonstrates the way in which hospital staff reconstructed the identities of the pseudopatients in order to substantiate the original diagnoses. The pseudopatients had become "objectified" in that their behaviour would only be explained by hospital staff in terms of a spurious label. In many respects the stigmatization described by the boys of the present study gives them much in common with Rosenhan's pseudopatients. In this sense, it is not fair to attribute this stigmatization to the effects of residential special schools, but to certain myths which cling to their shadow. The second half of this chapter will attempt to help dispel these myths further by defining the actual effects of the schools more clearly.

(ii) Key Features of Residential Life and Their Effects on Pupils

In this section an analysis of the key features of residential life, as defined chiefly by the boys of this study, will be presented. Having already explored, through an application of Goffman's model of the total institution, the extent to which the schools can be seen as forces of institutionalization, and shown that the worst effects of institutionalization are absent, it now remains to expand on the actual outcomes of the residential experience for these boys. In our exploration of institutionalization, we found, in fact, that certain of the features which superficially resembled Goffman's "curtailments" and "defilements",

far from being characteristic of a dehumanizing environment, resulted in positive outcomes for the boys. The following section will amplify some of these points as well as add to them. Listed below are the key areas for discussion in the rest of this chapter:

- (a) Residential Schools as Havens: the Significance of "Respite"
- (b) Social Relationships in the School and Re-Signification
- (c) The Role of the School Principal
- (d) The Formal Organization of the School

Consideration will now be given to each of these 4 areas.

- (a) *Residential schools as havens: the significance of "respite"*

The opening chapter of this thesis dealt with the concept of "respite" in considerable detail, identifying the key social correlates of emotional and behavioural difficulties and the ways in which residential schools could help to alleviate these difficulties by removing the pupils from their source. Because the significance of respite rests essentially in the situations from which the pupils are kept, and less in the nature of the provision to which they are sent, it was felt that this was best dealt with in the introductory chapter. It remains, however, a significant effect of the residential experience for the pupils in this study, and requires to be restated briefly.

It will be recalled that 34 out of 55 boys, from both schools, who returned questionnaires with a response to the statement "One of the good things about being here is that it gives you a break from being at home", agreed with the statement (see chapter 6). This response is supported by interviewees who describe feelings of relief at being away from home, and upon returning to school after unsatisfactory events at home. It is also supported by those who claim improvements in family relationships as a result of separation, and the cooling off of eruptions of conflict in the family. Pupils from both schools also indicate that the school provides some of them with respite from the influence of delinquent peers and relations, as well as the penal consequences of such associations. The other major area from which pupils claim welcome respite is that of mainstream schools. The majority of pupils in the two schools believed that their present schools were "better than an ordinary primary school" (41/57), "better than an ordinary comprehensive school" (42/57), and "better than a day special school" (42/57). The majority of children also agreed with the statement: "most of the pupils at this school are happier here than they were at other schools" (40/56) (see chapter 6, and appendix III). These points were further substantiated by the interviewees' references to the uncaring, unhelpful and disrespectful attitudes that teachers displayed to them in mainstream schools and the far more positive attitudes of staff in the two fieldwork schools. The overwhelming majority of pupils believed the staff in the fieldwork schools to be "more friendly" (49/56), more helpful to pupils with their schoolwork (49/57), giving of more attention to pupils (50/57), "more understanding" (52/57) and less "bossy" (40/51), than their "ordinary" day school counterparts (see chapter 6, and appendix III).

These findings echo much of the theoretical output of the pioneer workers in the residential field (see chapter 2), as well as that of writers who have attempted to account for disaffection among pupils in mainstream schools (see chapter 1). It is at this point, where we begin to find respite being discussed in terms of the quality of the residential experience, that we move into the central realm of concern of the present thesis, that is, the experiences the individual undergoes during the period of respite. It is argued that respite from major sources of dissatisfaction helps to create a situation in which pupils become susceptible to the influences of the residential school. These influences will now be dealt with in detail.

(b) *Social relations in the schools and re-signification*

It should be of little surprise that the quality of social relationships enjoyed by the boys of this study with staff and with one another, is a major preoccupation of these boys. The centrality of social interaction to the educational enterprise has long been recognized. Its history can be traced back to Plato, who presented philosophical writings in the form of dialogues, and is reputed to have devised what has come to be known as "Socratic questioning" of the pupil by his personal tutor as an instructional model (Cahn, 1970). Later, John Locke, the great 17th century humanist philosopher, stressed the importance of reasoning with children in their intellectual and moral development. Like Plato before him, Locke saw the personal tutor as a vital tool in this developmental process. Rousseau, in the 18th century, was concerned with the way in

which man "perverts and disfigures everything" (Cahn, p.155). His first instruction to the imaginary tutor of Emile is:

[...] to be humane. Love childhood. Look with friendly eyes on its games, its pleasures, its amiable dispositions.
(Cahn, p.159).

Philosophers of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, such as John Dewey, Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell, showed a concern with mass education for citizenship. Dewey and Russell were overtly concerned with education for democracy, and Russell complained that:

[...] education is treated as a means of acquiring power over the pupil, not as a means of nourishing his own growth [...]
(Rubinstein and Stoneman, 1970, p.27).

Whilst Whitehead (1932) stated:

The real point is to discover in practice that exact balance freedom and discipline [...] (p.54)

In the broader sphere of child development we have already (chapter 1) noted the extent to which the child's family relationships may affect his development and social orientation, as Pringle (1975) states:

[...] learning (in the widest sense of the word) and emotion, the cognitive and affective aspects of development, intellect and feelings, are so closely interwoven and from so early an age as to be almost indivisible [...] *The essential driving force of the will to learn has its roots in the quality of relationships available to the child right from the beginning of life.*
(p.33, emphasis in original)

Through the experience of receiving love and affection, the individual develops a view of himself as a worthy object of such attentions from others, and as a result develops the ability to show these feelings to others. Similarly, the pleasure derived from gaining praise and recognition for an act encourages the individual to repeat the act. Pringle's view is that the developing child adopts a view of himself that is derived from the views of himself that he perceives to be held by significant persons in his life, such as parents, teachers and peers. These views are communicated through the interactions that take place between the individual and these persons.

George Herbert Mead (1932) sees "the self" entirely as a social product, arising from social interaction. Mead, like Pringle after him, recognized that during social interaction the perceptions the actors have of one another are covertly communicated. Individuals, Mead argues, adopt the perceptions of themselves that they perceive to be communicated by "significant others", by "taking the role of the other". Thus the development of the self concept depends upon the individual's experience of and treatment by others. This ability to "take the role of the other" is, according to Mead, the central human attribute. It is in this way that the self-image develops a predictive force, in that the individual uses his ability to "take the role of the other" to determine what will be perceived as appropriate or inappropriate behaviour in a given situation. According to this archetypal symbolic interactionist view, the self only emerges when the individual is able to adopt, not only the attitudes of others towards himself, but also, the attitudes of others "towards one another within the human social process" (Mead, p.47). It is in this way that a community of

values is developed and perpetuated, and, therefore, a view which accounts for the construction of society.

The present study has demonstrated the real life significance of this theoretical account. We have seen how self-images can relate to social experience, and how these self-images can lead to the adoption of associated sets of values. We have seen how both positive and negative outcomes can spring from the adolescent's quest for membership of a community which will offer the chance for him to develop a positive self-image. We saw how pupils from both schools, in describing their perceptions of the reasons for their referral to the schools, repeatedly described their own failings as the cause of their referral. That these boys had low levels of self-esteem upon referral is highlighted by the vocabulary they use to describe their exits from mainstream schools. Recurrent usage of the terms "chucked out", "thrown out", "kicked out" support this point. In one sense this is surprising, particularly when we consider the degree to which dissatisfaction with home and school life, and the often intolerable pressures created in these situations, are featured in pupils' responses. The interactionist framework, however, reveals to us the obstacles which prevent individuals from perceiving the involvement of significant others in the *construction* of their deviant identities. For in spite of their dissatisfaction with their teachers and parents, and their recognition of the faults of these "others", these boys are powerless to resist the internalization of these images of themselves, especially when the images are consistent with the values and views of the "generalized other" (ie. the wider social context). So it is in spite of, and owing to, the injustices, inequalities, humiliations and deprivations, that many have

experienced in schools and at home, that they perceive the fault as lying within themselves. They have, in fact, adopted the very value system which has so successfully humiliated and undermined them and cast them in deviant roles. This also helps to explain why the boys sometimes express disapproval of their home based delinquent peers once they have respite from their influence. Residential referral is not, however, a wholly negative experience, however, as a result of the experiences the boys undergo during the period of respite it provides.

Simply to inculcate individuals with attitudes which cause them to internalize poor images of self is a destructive process, which would seem to be well underway at the pupils' time of referral to Lakeside or Farfield; the achievement of these schools is to lift pupils' sense of self-worth whilst allowing them to maintain values which are consistent with those of the "generalized other". It is in this way that the evidence of this study can be seen to show the full extent to which Goffman's model fails to account for these two institutions, for, far from dehumanizing their inmates, these two schools help to restore, and may even help create, a sense of human integrity in their inmates. It is to this process that we now turn our attention.

If it is through experiences of interpersonal relationships that individuals can be seen to develop low self-images and deviant identities, then it is through the same medium that alternative views of self should be sought. There is much evidence in the testimony of the boys in the present study to support the fruitfulness of this view. It is clear from the responses of the vast majority of boys that they feel valued by the staff

of their respective schools. They are conscious of being cared for, and from this, traces of improved self-images emerge, as the boys begin to adopt the images of themselves projected by the staff (who are, of course, "significant others"). Furthermore, there is evidence from both schools of this sense of self-worth manifesting itself in some boys' caring attitudes towards fellow pupils. It is argued here, that this development of a positive self-image is achieved through a process of "re-signification", to which we will now turn our attention.

The term "signification" has been employed, by Hargreaves et al. (1975) and others, to describe a central component of the labelling process. The term is used by Matza (1969) to describe the point at which an individual's persona becomes identified with a particular form of deviance. To put it another way, it is the process by which the individual becomes "objectified" as a "truant", "bully", "yob" or "div". It is the process in which only the individual's perceived deviant behaviour is taken as his significant behaviour. It is when, in common staffroom parlance, "that boy in 3C starts to show his true colours." As Matza puts it:

To signify is to *stand for* in the sense of representing or exemplifying. An object that is signified, whether it be a man or a thing, is rendered more meaningful. To be signified a thief does not assure the continuation of such pursuits; but it *does* add to the meaning of a theft in the life of that person in the eyes of others [...] signifying makes its object more significant [...] The object enjoys or suffers enhanced meaning. To be signified a thief is to lose the blissful identity of one, who among other things happens to have committed a theft. (p.27)

Re-signification, argues the present writer, is a process whereby individuals come to be exemplified in terms which *directly* oppose those of

a former signification. Thus, pupils in the present study who describe reasons for their referral in terms of their own negative behaviour, find themselves, at the time of their entry into the school, facing, in the most real sense, the consequences of signification. During their time at the school, however, many pupils come to internalize more positive views of themselves; they begin to define themselves in terms of more positive human qualities. This outcome is both an instrument of and a result of the fulfilment of deeply felt emotional needs, and it is a product of their school experience. It is important to note that this process, to a large extent, arises out of the original signification process. Re-signification is the development of a self-image which bears constant reference to the negative self-image which accompanied the new arrival to the school; it is based on a recognition and acceptance of the initial negative self-image, as well as a belief that this negative image is no longer an appropriate definition of self. It also involves, for many boys, the development of new definitions of such concepts as: "adult", "teacher", "work" and "school".

One of the most striking examples of re-signification is provided by Stan (Lakeside). Stan admits to having been a persistent truant from his mainstream school and the victim of bullying there. Understandably, he was fearful of attending a school in which truancy was virtually impossible, and where contact with other pupils was constant. This fear manifested itself on his first day at the school, in his reluctance to enter the school grounds. He spent his first hour, after his mother left, at "the bottom of the drive", refusing to go a step further. After much coaxing, a sympathetic member of staff eventually persuaded him to enter.

The transformation from initial feelings of dislike and even "hatred" of the school, to subsequent feelings of affection toward the place is unmistakable. This process was by no means an easy or smooth passage. It was punctuated by at least one act of violence of which Stan was victim, and which led to his absconding. Stan describes, however, how he has changed his image of himself as a friendless boy, unable to "face" school, to a boy with friends whom, when he is away from school, he misses, and a boy who is now able to attend school with ease. As a description of the development of self-confidence from a basis of low self-esteem, Stan's story is striking. Stan refers to the relationship he has with his class teacher as a major factor in these developments:

I think he's helped me quite a bit. He's helped me with my work; talked to me quite a bit. Like I never used to like going anywhere to do anything; now I feel quite happy to go to snooker clubs [...] He's got me involved in the snooker club. I never used to play snooker before. He takes quite a few of us.
(Lakeside, section 7)

He summarizes his feelings like this:

The school has made me grow up in myself. Helped me to go to school and get on with my classwork. I'm more confident in myself.

For Stan, the process of re-signification started on his first day at the school. The therapeutic response of the staff to his first deviant act was the first of many subsequent efforts to build Stan's self-image. The way in which Stan's original negative self-image is referred to by Stan, and is used to define the changes he has undergone, is at the heart of re-signification.

The importance of counselling and therapeutic, as opposed to punitive, responses to deviance can be a vital part of the re-signification process. This is the case because the maintenance of a stable self-image depends to a large extent on reinforcement (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). Rosser and Harré (1976) employ the concept of "secondary deviance" to show how particular reactions to initial acts of deviance ("primary deviance"), can themselves lead to further deviance, sometimes of greater intensity than the initial deviance. This view is consistent with findings of the present research, as well as that of other writers discussed earlier (eg. Schostak, 1982, 1983; Davies, 1984; Tattum, 1982; Kronk, 1987), who show that pupils often justify acts of deviance with reference to the disrespectful and often humiliating way they are treated by teachers, as a result of, what they see, as relatively minor acts of deviance. It is the continuing, detested reactions of some teachers to minor misbehaviour that becomes, in itself, a spur to further deviance. In this way some teachers' actions can be said to be "deviance provocative" (Hargreaves et al., 1975). One of the ways in which this spiral of deviance can be impeded is through the initiation of an unpredicted response, as is seen in the present study. Larry (Lakeside, section 4) is disarmingly frank in his admission of an ambivalent attitude towards the school and its staff. Like Ryan (Farfield) Larry's mode of adaptation is essentially calculative (see section 1 of this chapter). He describes his attempts to "beat the system", at Lakeside, and, in so doing, echoes Ryan's (Farfield, section 4) complaints that he is being "used" by the school principal. Both boys, however, in spite of their somewhat defensive postures, reveal the power of therapeutic approaches to acts of deviance, by describing the effects of such responses

on their own attitudes and behaviour. Larry describes an incident in which he storms out of the school dining room, after a gentle reprimand from a member of staff concerning the amount of food he had taken:

He [the staff member] came after me, after about 15 minutes, when I'd had a good cry in the bathroom, and said, "try not to worry too much about what's happening." I can't remember what he said now, but he gave me new ideas. (Lakeside, section 4)

Central features in Larry's perception of the situation are: (a) his recognition that an act of minor deviance appeared to trigger the situation, (b) the staff member's consideration of Larry's feelings in his sympathetic response to Larry, (c) the staff member's focussing of his response on Larry's emotional state rather than his behaviour. The precise details of the staff member's counselling are not recalled by Larry; it is the *manner* of the approach which is recalled, and the way in which Larry's behaviour is taken to signify a state of personal anxiety rather than a deviant personality. This is a reversal of the signification process by which individual's come to be characterized in terms of the deviant acts they commit. Here the staff member is, in a sense, refusing to take a deviant act at face value, and insisting that the act must have a reasonable explanation. In so doing the staff member is implying an image of the boy as a reasonable individual, worthy of care and consideration. The importance of this type of response, to Larry in particular, is shown by the way in which such a response does not characterize his experience prior to referral to Lakeside. At home, Larry claims to have been "hit around a lot" by his father, and to have had a poor relationship with his stepmother (Lakeside, section 1). Physical violence is perhaps one of the most effective means of denying the individual of a human identity, by

reducing him to the status of an object to be physically manipulated (Goffman, 1961). What we see here in Larry then, is an emerging sense of himself as a valuable human person worthy of the care and positive attention of others. Given his history, however, it is not surprising that he is still somewhat suspicious of "the system" of the school, and enthusiastic about the conflicts he perceives between the boys and the "system". The contradictions in Larry's account, however, are suggestive of an ongoing positive development: he wishes to fight the system, but at the same time believes that pupils should co-operate more with staff and recognizes the immense personal benefits of staff-pupil relationships at the school; he believes that staff should be more strict but that he will be "one of the first" to break any new rules that are created. Larry has yet, perhaps, to perceive a link between the individuals of the staff and the "system" which, he believes, they collectively represent.

Ryan, from the Farfield sample, provides us with an account of an incident (Farfield, section 4) which shares many of the features observed in Larry's account, and sheds further light on the process of re-signification. When Ryan's key worker discovered that Ryan was in possession of stolen clothing his reaction was not punitive, but entailed counselling. According to Ryan, as a result of this incident, he felt regret at having let down his key worker, whom he held in high regard, and vowed not to commit such an act again. Ryan uses this incident to exemplify the way in which Farfield has helped him "straighten out". This can be interpreted through reference to re-signification in terms of Ryan's desire to modify his behaviour in order to maintain the improved self-image that has begun to develop partly owing to his relationship with his key

worker. Ryan consciously wishes to behave in accordance with the self-image of one who has begun to "straighten out". This perceived need to consciously sustain the more desirable self-image might be seen as a part of the re-signification process which is distinct from that of simply recognizing that such a process is in operation. In this way Ryan can be seen to be more advanced in the process than Larry.

The process of re-signification, as defined here, is best exemplified through reference to two significant areas: evidence of change in pupils' self-images, and their descriptions of the characteristics of staff in their present schools. The following items taken from interviews with pupils (both studies, section 7), refer to changes boys believe themselves to have undergone since being at their present schools:

- improved sociability and self-confidence in social settings;
- development of the ability to share personal problems with others;
- improved self-image as a result of gaining mastery over practical and academic skills;
- improvements in social behaviour and personal attitudes;
- improved control of temper;
- loss of inclination to commit delinquent acts;
- lessening of personal anxiety, increased calmness;
- improved relationships with family and peers.

Each of these items is indicative of improvements in self-image. It is suggested that the following staff characteristics, described by boys (both studies, section 4), contribute significantly to these improvements:

staff are friendly and approachable;

- " " helpful with pupils' personal problems and academic difficulties;
- " " understanding and sympathetic in their dealings with pupils;
- " " willing to share their time with pupils;
- " " less strict and formal than mainstream teachers;
- " " "fair" in their dealings with pupils;
- " " willing to "have a laugh" with pupils;
- " " generally tolerant in their dealings with pupils.

We have already noted the way in which these pupils see many of their mainstream teachers as lacking these qualities, if not possessing the complete opposite of them. This view of mainstream teachers is certainly supported by other researchers (eg. Rosser and Harré, 1976; Tattum, 1982; Schostak, 1983; Cronk, 1987). Reid (1985) in his study of school truancy and absenteeism, perhaps more significantly, provides a list of teacher characteristics most sought by pupils in mainstream schools, which bears interesting similarities with the items listed above:

Teachers should be strict but fair;

- " " give pupils individual attention;
- " " be able to help children with their personal problems and needs;
- " " have a sense of humour and be understanding in their dealings with pupils;
- " " be able to give pupils who need it, academic remedial help.

This comparison underlines the way in which the poor quality of staff-pupil relationships in some schools, can both contribute to the development of negative self-images and anti-school values, and how the qualities of staff in the two fieldwork schools, as defined by the pupils, supply some of these interpersonal deficiencies, and contribute to improvements in pupils' self-images.

Davies (1984) provides us with a useful means of understanding more of the detail of this process of re-signification. In her discussion of how deviant schoolgirls develop a sense of personal identity, Davies applies the concept of "scripts". A script is defined as:

[...] the way an individual makes a statement about both their [sic] identity and their definition of the situation [...] It is the result of a person formulating a certain interpretation, combination or selection of wider type scripts [...] A person's script [...] indicates where that person stands in relation to what he or she perceives to be going on. (p.96)

The concept of the script takes account not only of the group's influence on the individual but also stresses the interaction which occurs between group expectations and the individual's personal range of social constructs which have been developed on the basis of previous social encounters. In this sense, the concept of the script accounts for a high degree of fluidity and flexibility in the notion of identity, and, therefore, a wide variation in possible patterns of behaviour. The individual's identity is in no sense rigidly confirmed, or completely externally imposed. It has a malleable quality that is influenced by the particular experience of the individual, and to that extent is personal to the individual. The

influence of significant others, as we have already shown, is still seen to be of paramount significance, as Davies states:

A person's repertoire of acts and statuses originates in, and must be validated by the social group [...] (p.98)

Within these constraints, however, the actor has the ability to:

[...] write or re-write his or her own lines; to perform differently in different programmes, in public and in private; to experiment with different parts within the same play; to ad lib, to edit; to forget. (p.98)

The importance of taking the part of the other then, lies in the fact that this provides the individual with a frame of reference within which his script must be performed. The frames of reference, for our present purposes, may be conceived in terms of constraints and opportunities. Negative labelling constrains the individual into producing a script which can only be validated in terms of the degree to which it can be taken to project a deviant identity. Re-signification, however, provides the individual with opportunities to experiment with a wider range of scripts, by providing a frame of reference which permits validation of the non-deviant identity.

This creative aspect of script formulation, which allows for roles to be performed in unpredictable ways, is powerfully demonstrated in the present study, in the attitudes and behaviour of some of the boys towards one another. Jock (Lakeside, section 1) describes a befriending "system" which he claims had operated between the older and younger boys at Lakeside, whereby older pupils befriended new arrivals to the school, and guided them through its routines; its formal and informal rules. Jock is

adamant about the fact that this system was entirely the work of the boys and not a "staff idea". Similarly, in the Farfield study, Ryan and Lewis show considerable compassion and care towards other boys (Farfield, section 4). Ryan describes his sympathy for the younger boys, whom he believes to be vulnerable and in need of protection. Lewis, on the other hand, shows surprising compassion for Max, the former school bully. Lewis believes that more sympathetic and considerate handling of Max by the school staff might have made him less problematic. These three examples show how the individuals concerned develop their own scripts, for performance within the pupil culture, which owe much to the influence of staff behaviour and the models they provide, but which are performed not simply for validation by the staff. This suggests, as Davies shows, the way in which the actor can be creatively involved in the development of his own identity by carrying over an identity established in one situation into a different situation, and even experimenting with different scripts. In the cases of Ryan and the Lakeside boys, the script of the "protective big brother" seems to have been carried off successfully, whilst Lewis's attempt at "psychologist" is highly convincing. This shows how the re-signification process extends beyond the confines of the staff-pupil relationship into areas of pupils' lives less available to staff influence.

It would be unrepresentative of the research findings to leave a section concerned with relationships within the schools, without making some reference to the "whipping boy/bully" phenomenon (Olweus, 1984). Evidence of the existence of "whipping boys" and bullies is present in both studies and has been noted. Whilst it is difficult in a study of this type to determine the degree to which bullying has increased or decreased in the

schools over a period of time, it is important to note that all pupils who claim to be, or to have been, victims of bullying, express satisfaction with their schools. They claim to be happier in their present schools than they have been in other institutions. They also express general satisfaction with the relationships they share with peers. There is evidence to suggest that, for some pupils, their residential experience may have helped them to overcome their "whipping boy" status. Stan (Lakeside), without making the connection himself, describes his own development from a timid, friendless truant, who was the victim of bullying in his mainstream school, to a boy who sees himself as more confident, willing and able to attend school, with friends at school. In the early stages of his time at Lakeside he claims to have been bullied, but this appears to have decreased in more recent times. Ryan describes a similar experience at Farfield, as does Alan, who, however, appears still to be a "whipping boy", though to a lesser extent than before. This would seem to suggest then that "whipping boy" status is amenable to the effects of re-signification.

In this section it has not been the writer's intention to claim that all pupils at the two schools undergo a process of re-signification during their stay at the schools. That this process does occur, however, has been demonstrated, and explored in relation to the residential experience. Whilst it is not claimed that re-signification of this type can only occur in residential settings, it has been suggested that the process is aided by particular features of the residential setting, including the respite such a setting provides from home based difficulties. What is clear, however, is that the tools of positive re-signification, which are chiefly concerned with staff-pupil relationships and the

opportunities provided in both schools for success in a wide range of activities, are recognized as existing in both schools and as being of significance by a majority of pupils.

It is now necessary to turn to another prominent feature in the residential experience of these boys: the school principal. And to explore the contribution that these individuals and their office make to the quality of the residential experience.

(c) *The role of the school principal*

The importance of the head of the school (referred to as the Principal at Farfield, and the Head Master at Lakeside) in the lives of the boys in both schools, is emphasised strongly in the interview data. The head is perceived to have an immense influence over the day to day lives of the pupils. To some extent he is seen as a point of focus for pupils' feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the school. Because of their prominence in the boys' accounts, it is necessary to explore the way in which these heads relate to the re-signification process, which we have identified as a central process at work in the two schools. An invaluable insight into the nature and function of the head of school is provided by the pupils of Lakeside, many of whom in interview made repeated reference to the fact that their school had recently undergone a change of head. Particular insights to be drawn from this state of affairs will be dealt with after some general analysis of this subject.

Pupils in both schools attributed the following functions to the head:

chief decision maker on school matters

chief rule maker

chief source of rewards and sanctions.

In addition to these roles the Farfield principal was often seen as the provider of financial support for pupils and the school in general. He was often described as buying items for the school with his personal funds. For many pupils this role of provider was cited to exemplify the degree to which the principal cared personally for the boys. On the other hand, the departed Lakeside head was presented by the boys as being held in high personal regard by pupils, for his personal qualities. This is demonstrated by the many expressions of distress that boys declare when referring to his departure.

To draw the conclusion that the two school heads were perceived by boys as leaders of their communities, is not as pedestrian a remark as it might at first appear. Handy and Aitken (1986) describe as a common failing among educationists, as well as other professionals, their tendency to devalue the management function rather than seeing it as a "key activity" (p.13) of the educational organization. The importance of management skills, particularly those of headteachers, has been considered an important - if perhaps rare - area of competence in the EBD sphere. Wilson and Evans (1980), in their wide ranging study of the diversity of

provision for for EBD children in England and Wales, place strong emphasis on the management skills of headteachers:

[...] the headteacher played an important role in enabling staff to acquire skills, develop the attitudes and adopt the practices that combine to create a caring environment [...] They had [...] the capacity to lead without being authoritarian [...] It was the head who set the level of expectation in the school [...] [...] Furthermore, however studiously non-hierarchical a school may be there is no escaping the fact that authority is personified in the head, who is ultimately accountable and in charge. The head's acceptance of this authority role makes for security in the school as a whole [...] (pp.81-2)

Ted Cole (1986), speaking specifically on the role of the headteacher in a residential special school, favours, in ideal circumstances, the "democratic but positive leader" (p.124), but goes on to declare:

[...] an autocrat is better than a leader who lets things drift, gives little clear guidance, adopts an *ad hoc* approach [...]

(p.124)

Galletley (1984), in advocating a "collective responsibility" approach to management in the special school, concludes that "adults in school do need to be led" (p.81). Whilst Galletley suggests that a head need "not have to lead alone", leadership, he goes on to say, is still a primary quality demanded of the headteacher. In support of all that has been said here is the work of Bridgeland (1971), on the pioneer workers with EBD children. Bridgeland repeatedly stresses the importance of firm and clear sighted leadership as a contributory factor in the success of many of the early enterprises in this field. In fact the very shape of his study, with at

its focal point the individuals who started the early schools, makes this point very clearly.

It is argued on the basis of the present study that the quality of leadership shown by the head of the school does have a bearing on the re-signification process. It is suggested that firm, consistent leadership, coupled with perceived qualities of caring contribute powerfully to the boys' feelings of well being and their improved levels of self-esteem. In this way the heads of the schools embody for their pupils each school's ethos. Perceived failings in these areas, however, are seen to threaten the therapeutic process by undermining the boys' sense of security and confidence in the schools.

Rutter et al. (1979) define "ethos" in terms of the "rules, values and standards of behaviour" (p.184) which pervade social groups, and thus endow groups with a particular "style and quality of life" (p.183). The relationship between the individual who is head of the school and the ethos of the school is demonstrated in both of the schools studied here, and particularly at Lakeside. The heads are seen as the dominant rule makers, and whilst pupils from both schools complain about the restrictive nature and pettiness of certain rules, they also indicate a shared sense of comfort and security on the basis of the presence of certain of these controls. This is demonstrated most effectively by boys at Lakeside who complain of the disorder and increased misbehaviour (in which some admit to being involved) of pupils, which they attribute to the increase in freedom and relaxation of certain restrictions instigated by the new head master. Boys, for the most part, speak in praise of the harsher regime presided

over by the former head master, which they claim minimized opportunities for misbehaviour. Whilst many boys admit to there being positive outcomes from the increased level of freedom, there is clearly a sense in which some of them question the price they have paid for such freedom.

Values are central to the ethos of any community and especially significant to schools. Values are expressed in the ways in which individuals interact with one another. Care and concern have already emerged as major attributes of staff behaviour towards the boys, and we have seen how these values are also reflected in the relationships in the pupil culture. It has been argued that it is through the enactment of such values that pupils come to appreciate a sense of their own value, and thus go on to enact these values in their relationships with others. Whilst the majority of staff in both schools are perceived as possessing these positive qualities, they are seen to be located at Farfield in the person of the principal, and at Lakeside in the former head master. The principal at Farfield is perceived, by many boys, to display his caring attitude through his supposed material generosity. He is also believed to take a personal interest in each pupil, and is valued as an adviser. The former head at Lakeside is considered to have combined strictness, fairness and a sense of humour in his dealings with pupils. He was the object of much personal respect and warmth. Both of these heads are clearly capable of generating trust and a certain amount of devotion among their pupils. This sense of devotion is a possible explanation for the acceptance of corporal punishment from the former Lakeside head.

Where the head is seen to fail in his trustworthiness the pupils' sense of well being can be undermined. This is demonstrated by Ryan's suspicions of exploitation, and Lewis's sense of betrayal by the principal over a particular incident (see chapter 4). The new Lakeside head master fails to excite the devotion given to his predecessor, partly because he has the role, in the pupils' eyes, of usurper; a role he has emphasised in the changes he has made in the school organization. Even he, however, is considered by pupils to be caring and considerate towards them; a fact underlined by the surprisingly high number of boys who claim that they would prefer to approach him for help if they had personal problems (see questionnaire responses, chapter 6).

The heads are seen as models by the pupils; their behaviour is scrutinized, criticized, and interpreted in terms of the values it promotes. At best they are believed to be fair minded, not easily fooled and caring. At worst, they are seen as manipulative and incompetent. The image of the heads that most pupils adhere to, reveals them as embodying an ethos which emphasises a caring attitude to pupils. In the case of the Farfield head, this is combined with a degree of control which gives rise to a sense of security that is somewhat lacking at Lakeside. The very presence of the new Lakeside head is a source of insecurity for some Lakeside boys, simply because he is a constant reminder of the loss of their much loved former head. The changes he has made in the organization of the school, for better or worse, further underline this loss. It is an indication of the vital importance of the head's role that this preoccupation reveals. For many boys the heads of the two schools represent highly significant adult relationships which are cornerstones in

sense of security which is so important to their emotional development (Pringle, 1975).

The contrast between authority figures who can be trusted, admired and even liked by pupils, with the adults in authority that these boys have often known prior to referral, is striking. It must be stressed that this contrast rests in the *perceptions* of the boys, but is no less significant for that. These boys, perhaps through bitter experience, are sensitive to the nuances in the behaviour of their significant others. The weaknesses of the three principals of the present study are not ignored - even by those boys who might be termed admirers; failures of trust are particularly significant. What these pupils have to say, however, permits us a further insight into Wills's (1971) informed view of the importance of leadership in residential communities:

[...] it is clear that what such an institution is depends in a large measure upon the quality of the man who is leading it.
(p.22)

It is, once again, necessary to make allowances for the unconscious sexism displayed here, but it is also important to recognize the relevance of this statement to the present research. The only qualification that the present writer would add to Wills's words is that it is not so much what the person-in-charge is that is of significance, so much as what that person is perceived to be, particularly by the inmates of the establishment.

It is now necessary to turn our attention to aspects of the formal organization of the two fieldwork institutions, in order to examine the means by which the institutions formally enact their objectives.

(d) *The formal organization of the school*

A major factor influencing the decision to place any pupil in a form of off-site SEN provision, is the degree to which the pupil concerned is seen to be in harmony with organizational pattern of the mainstream school. Disruptive behaviour is the epitome of disharmony in this context, as writers such as Badger (1985) show in their definitions of such behaviour as:

Behaviour which significantly interferes with the teaching process, and/or significantly interferes with the routine operations of the school. (p.7)

Other writers, such as Lawrence et al. (1984), Rutter et al. (1979) and Reynolds (1976, 1979, 1984) have stressed the significance of the organizational system of schools in relation to pupil disaffection and disruption. It has been shown by these writers how the organizational needs of a school can conflict with the interests of pupils, and how disaffection can stem from this. The particular form in which this disaffection manifests itself, however, is highly significant, and certain school responses add further support to this "systems" view of disruption. It has been argued (Ford et al., 1982, p.147) that pupils whose apparent failure to learn in school is attributed to his/her "withdrawn" behaviour, are less likely to be referred for specialist treatment than the pupil whose equally limited progress is attributed to "aggressive" behaviour:

[...] the emphasis upon aggressive characteristics over all others [...] confirms that the primary needs being met are those of the educational service itself. (p.147)

The view that organizations often have goals which are not wholly compatible with the best interests or inclinations of their participants is identified by Etzioni (1975) as the problem of securing the "compliance" of lower participants in an organization. The organization that fails to gain an adequate degree of compliance will be impaired in the achievement of its goals. This tension is explored in the present section, with particular reference to a comparison between the compliance structures found to be at work in the schools of the present study, with what is known of those at work in some state mainstream schools which have been the subject of detailed research.

We have already noted that many of the pupils enter Lakeside and Fairfield with poor self-images. Some are victims of chaotic and rejecting families; the vast majority have been formally rejected by mainstream schools and teachers; some are conscious also of the hopelessness of the delinquency trap that lurks within certain peer group associations. It has been suggested that self-esteem has been raised in many of these children through a process of re-signification, whereby a new group of "significant others" help the boys to perceive themselves in more positive ways, that do not ignore or disguise negative features of the boys' behaviour, but use these as a starting point for the building of a positive self-image. The patterns of interaction which facilitate re-signification can be characterized by the wider range of "scripts" that are made available to the boys in the residential setting. It is argued that re-signification, as defined here, is made possible by particular aspects of the formal systems of organization in the schools.

Organizational form has been described as developing from the values and aims of the participants in an organization; values and aims are embodied in the "goals" of the organization (Handy, 1981; Handy and Aitken, 1986, and Etzioni, 1975). Compliance by the lower participants is dependent upon an appropriate link between the organization's goals and the means chosen by the higher participants to obtain compliance. Such means can be described as "compliance structures" (Etzioni, 1975). Whether or not the compliance structure is seen as "appropriate" depends on the perceptions of the lower participants (Silverman, 1970). It is in this sense that organizational structure can be seen as a social structure, born out of the formal and informal interactions and perceptions of the participants.

According to Etzioni, organizations can be divided into 3 distinct categories according to their goals. These goals are:

order goals, which are primarily concerned with social control (such as prisons);

economic goals, which are primarily concerned with financial profit (such as commercial enterprises);

cultural goals, which are primarily concerned with the propagation and dissemination of symbolic objects (such as religious educational organizations).

Organizations may, of course, combine different goal categories; for example private schools may combine economic and cultural goals. Etzioni also describes three "compliance structures"; these are:

coercive, which is the use of physical or psychological force on lower participants;

utilitarian (remunerative), which is the manipulation of material reward;

normative (identitative), which is the manipulation and allocation of symbols, status and prestige.

Etzioni claims that the most effective combinations of compliance and goal structures are:

coercive + order

utilitarian + calculative

normative + moral

In turn, however, each type of compliance structure is associated with a particular form of involvement by lower participants. These are:

coercive > alienative

utilitarian > calculative

normative > moral

Alienative involvement describes the grudging involvement of an unwilling participant (such as a prisoner); he may well desire to subvert the organization's goals, and is only restrained from so-doing by the fear of punishment. *Calculative involvement* describes the situation in which the participant's mode of involvement is dictated by the degree of material reward that is received in return for his effort. In such a situation involvement may decline with reductions in reward or with the failure of rewards to increase. Either way, involvement is limited. *Moral*

involvement, however, is based upon the individual's acceptance of the organization's normative goals; involvement is in itself a reward.

Many schools of course, like some other organizations, employ all of these compliance structures, in different weightings, in order to achieve different goal structures, and similarly, experience different modes of pupil involvement. The accompanying table (tableXXI) indicates examples of the range of goals with their related compliance and involvement structures.

Table XXI
Goal, Compliance and Involvement Structures in Schools
(Based on Etzioni, 1975)

GOALS	COMPLIANCE STRUCTURES	INVOLVEMENT
<i>Order</i> Compulsory attendance. Imposition of rules of conduct.	<i>Coercive</i> Physical/non physical punishment. Expulsion, suspension, exclusion.	<i>Alienative</i> Disruptive behaviour. Acts of subversion. Insolence, truancy.
<i>Economic</i> Preparation for employment.	<i>Utilitarian</i> Study towards public exams. Academic and conduct reports. Streaming.	<i>Calculative</i> Completion of tasks relating to exam. syllabus.
<i>Cultural</i> Communication of moral values social norms. Character development. Public image of school.	<i>Normative</i> Prefect/monitor system. Prize giving. School rituals. Personal praise.	<i>Moral</i> Extra-curricular involvement. Personal presentation. Expressions of personal loyalty.

In common with pupils in other studies (Hargreaves, 1967; Rosser and Harré, 1976; Tattum, 1982; Woods, 1984), the boys of the present study describe their mainstream school experience in terms indicative of alienative involvement. Work by Schostak (1983) indicates that coercive compliance strategies are common features of secondary schooling in Britain. He claims that there is a tendency in schools to deny pupils their right to individuality. Hemming (1980) makes a similar point. These writers suggest that disaffection is a far more widespread phenomenon than is generally believed, affecting the majority of children in our secondary schools, as a result of the humiliating and degrading treatment all pupils receive in our schools. Pupils, they argue, are deprived of opportunities for self-expression, and are often punished, or in other ways penalized, for expressions of individuality. Educational rewards are reserved for those who display docility and subserviance to the demands of schools. Schostak accounts for the surprisingly high level of compliance among pupils with this oppressive system, in terms of pupils' acceptance of these conditions as a necessary evil in return for the utilitarian reward of examination success, which, they are led to believe, are necessary for optimizing employment opportunities. The suggestion that the involvement of successful school pupils in their schools is essentially calculative, echoes work by King (1973), who found, in a study of 72 secondary schools, that calculative involvement was the dominant form of involvement among all pupils. He found moral involvement to be rare, and made no use of the alienative category in his analysis.

The outcome of an application of Etzioni's model in combination with some of the work done on disaffection in school pupils leads us to the

conclusion that alienative involvement in school children can be related to a lack of reward goals in the school organization. The pursuit of order goals, as has been demonstrated in the present research, can contribute to pupils' feelings of security, this, however, is dependent upon the presence of other more congenial goals, which, in the case of the schools in the present study, are of a normative nature (relating individuals' personal development). Where no such accompanying goals are present, however, order goals become nothing short of instruments of repression. Rewards may also be offered to pupils in the "instrumental" sphere of school life (King, 1973), in the form of academic rewards. Once again, as Schostak (1983) point out, the demands imposed by order goals are often made tolerable by the promise of such rewards. King also refers to the "affective" sphere of school life, which includes the extra-curricular life of the school, as well as normative aspects of school life such as prefect systems and the allocation of "house points". In mainstream schools, as many of the above named writers indicate, pupils who become disaffected often fail to be recipients of rewards in this area also (Hargreaves, 1967; Rutter et al., 1979; Reynolds, 1976, 1979 and 1984).

Schools are still dominated by instrumental goals. This manifests itself in the tendency towards streaming by ability, both formal and informal (Keddie, 1971; Eggleston, 1979), and the use of public examinations as measures of aptitude and ability. As Eggleston (1979) points out, the "teacher centredness" of many of our schools means that pupils' "non teacher approved" achievements are often ignored. The National Curriculum due to begin its phasing in process in 1989, will by definition make schools even more teacher centred, in its demand for

uniformity of curriculum and assessment. Furthermore, it has been suggested that teachers tend to prefer working with pupils with whom they can personally identify; such children tend to be middle class, academically gifted and from homes where behavioural expectations match those of traditionally formal schools (Sharp and Green, 1975). Pupils thus favoured receive more positive attention from their teachers and tend to receive more of the rewards that schooling has to offer: both instrumental and affective. The effect of this stress on instrumental goals and the teacher bias is the process of differentiation whereby large numbers of children are disbarred from self-esteem building high status positions in schools. In such circumstances compliance is often only achieved through the use of coercive tactics.

School organization then, can be seen to play a central role in undermining the self-esteem of some pupils, by denying them basic status needs. The school organization operates in a complex relationship with teacher attitudes and values, in achieving this undesired effect. Teachers' attitudes and values stem from their own experience, including their own experience of schooling as a pupil (Hargreaves et al., 1975). Such values and attitudes may well influence the ways in which teachers relate to their pupils, and may well result in the undermining of features of school organization which are often intended to compensate for such disadvantages suffered by some pupils. Such features might include mixed ability teaching, child-centred teaching methods, and pastoral support systems. Sharp and Green (1975) show how, in a "progressive" infant school, teachers felt least affinity with pupils from social backgrounds which were unlike their own social situations or backgrounds; such pupils

consequently received less positive attention from the teachers and were more likely to be labelled as "maladjusted" or "thick". Keddie (1971) shows how teachers differentiated between pupils who were ostensibly being taught the same subject matter, on the same course, owing to the teachers' perceptions of the pupils' abilities and levels of motivation, based on the streams they occupied. This differentiation was exemplified in the manner in which teachers responded to pupil interventions and questions. The same question asked by an 'A' stream boy was likely to be taken more seriously by the teachers than if asked by a 'C' stream pupil; the content of lessons was similarly tailored. Eggleston (1979) follows on from Keddie and Sharp and Green, by showing how a progressive school with unstreamed mixed ability groups, unintentionally achieved a high level of status differentiation among children within the same groups, by assigning them roles in an active learning situation which reflected the teachers' perceptions of differential ability levels: in a role play situation "bright" pupils were assigned the more active, high status role of doctor, whilst the "less able" were in more passive roles, such as hospital porter. As Eggleston points out, however, teachers who have an awareness of such pitfalls have far more chance of overcoming these difficulties in a school which is organized on "progressive" or "pupil-centred" lines. In a more traditional setting, where such differentiation is built into the organizational structure through streaming and an emphasis on academic achievement, such awareness may count for little, and even be seen by both pupils and colleagues as deviant. Thus, teacher attitude alone is not sufficient to create the type of school setting which is conducive to enhancing the self-esteem of all pupils.

In the schools of the present study, it was found that, from the pupils' viewpoint, there was a high degree of correspondence between the institutional and the personal expectations held of them. The values and attitudes of staff, as expressed through their relationships with pupils, were seen to be consistent with the general ethos presented by the official persona of each school, and enacted in the schools' organizational structures. As we have already noted, the schools provided settings in which the performance of new "scripts" could take place. To give an example, Stan's self-professed new sense of confidence (Lakeside, chapter 5, section 7) is achieved as a result of being provided, through the routines of the school, with an opportunity to tackle a new and challenging situation, thus enabling him to perform the script of the "positive achiever".

We have already noted the extent to which pupils in both schools value the relationships they share with staff and the trust which they place in staff. It is suggested that these feelings of trust form the bedrock upon which the authority of the staff is based. As Handy states (1981), the degree of compliance demonstrated by lower participants is dependent upon the degree to which authority figures are judged by lower participants to have legitimate claim to authority. According to Weber (1947) there are three types of legitimate authority:

1. rational/legal
2. traditional
3. charismatic.

Where legitimacy is linked with the perceived personal qualities of leaders, this is referred to as "charismatic" authority. This is demonstrated repeatedly in the present study, where pupils refer to their personal loyalties to staff members, and the ways in which this leads to their compliance with organizational demands. This is particularly emphasized by the difficulties which pupils at Lakeside face in accepting their new head master, in spite of the benefits of the organizational changes he introduces. Although the changes are beneficial the legitimacy of the new head's authority to make such changes is challenged by pupils. At Farfield the development of such authority is encouraged by the use of "key worker groups", whereby pupils are assigned to particular RSW's, for the duration of their stay at the school, who have particular oversight of the overall welfare and development of the pupils in their group.

Boys in both schools are given opportunities to make positive achievements. One way in which this is accommodated in the formal organization of the schools, is through what may be termed "co-option" strategies. This term is borrowed from Reynolds and Sullivan (1979). It describes organizational strategies which promote the involvement of pupils in the life of the school across a wide range of areas. Co-optive strategies include: a high value being formally placed on the quality of staff-pupil relationships, with an emphasis on tolerance, rewards and praise as opposed to punishment; the employment of pupils, from across the ability range, in positions of status and authority (such as prefects); and the active participation of pupils in lessons through interactive and child-centred teaching methods. At both Lakeside and Farfield, boys were employed in positions of responsibility over other boys: this, and the high

quality of staff-pupil relationships, were considered by boys to be highly significant features of school life. Less is revealed about the quality of classroom interaction, although several pupils from both schools comment on the greater patience, helpfulness and sympathetic nature of their residential teachers in comparison with their mainstream counterparts. Also the general familiarity and approachability with which boys characterized teaching staff are suggestive of relaxed classroom experiences.

At Lakeside the formal system of "helpers" exists, and is a replacement for the former system of "leaders". As has already been explained (chapter 5), the difference in title reflects differences in power and status. Both systems, however, provide pupils with rewards for behaviour which is seen to contribute to the smooth running of the school. In this way the staff promote the compliance of pupils through both "calculative" involvement and "moral" involvement. That the calculative aspect is a secondary concern, however, is demonstrated by the boys' complaints that in spite of the general improvements in the availability of privileges to all boys, the lower status of "helpers" compared with "leaders" is most greatly missed. At Farfield the official status system among the boys is less clearly formalized, but is still evident. The boys are divided into "juniors" and "seniors" with corresponding access to certain privileges. Among the senior group is a high status group referred to as the "Joes", who are, in essence, specially chosen by the principal as monitors to do specific "jobs". Chief among the Joes is Lewis ("top boss") and second to him is Ryan. These top boys have supervisory roles over the other boys: the Joes have supervisory roles over non-Joes and the

seniors exercise authority, at the discretion of the principal, over junior boys. At the very base of the status hierarchy are the "cabbages" (see chapter 4). The hierarchy can be illustrated thus:

Lewis
Ryan
Other "Joes"
Other Senior Boys
Junior Boys
"Cabbages"

Whilst there is a calculative element in the system, there is a strong sense of moral involvement also. Lewis and Ryan exhibit this in their caring attitudes to fellow pupils, and the other boys reflect this in their attitudes towards Lewis and Ryan. High status in the formal and informal hierarchy is achieved through subscription to values which are shared by both the formal school system and the informal pupil culture.

Whilst the helper system at Lakeside appears to allow all pupils the opportunity to perform the helper script, the Joe system would appear to be more restricted. Only senior boys are Joes, and there is little overt indication of how Joes are selected by the principal. There is no doubt, however, that there is a close match between the formal hierarchy of Joes and what is known of the informal pupil hierarchy. Lewis and Ryan are clearly, on the basis of the interviews, the most respected and liked boys in the school by the other boys. It might be argued, therefore, that their

position in the formal status hierarchy provides the other boys with positive behavioural models, which are all the more influential for their informal popularity (Bandura, 1969). In turn, Ryan and Lewis themselves show signs of modelling their own attitudes and behaviour on those of admired and respected staff members.

This matching of the formal pupil status hierarchy with the informal pupil hierarchy is identified by Millham et al. (1975) as an effective control strategy employed by staff in approved schools. In their study, however, the inmate involvement was of a calculative nature, and the aim of the strategy, from a staff perspective, was to exert control over the inmate culture through "fragmentation of the inmate culture". By this method the development of deviant, anti-institution sub-cultures was inhibited. In terms of the present study "fragmentation" is too aggressive a term; "harnessing" is more appropriate. As was noted in the course of the interviews by Ryan (chapter 4), coercive as opposed to co-optive strategies were adopted by the principal in circumstances in which the pupil culture was dominated by pupils with negative attitudes towards the school. Ryan's observation is not supported or refuted by any other source of data. It is clear, however, that at the time of the study certain elements in existence in the pupil culture were operating for the benefit of the school, and that this outcome is clearly consistent with what is known of staff-pupil relationships.

There is, however, a fine line to be trodden between "harnessing the pupil culture" in the service of the school community, and allowing dominant members of the pupil culture to harness the official organization

for their own calculative ends. It is this latter situation which appears to have led to the abandonment of the "leaders" system at Lakeside. This also underlines the central significance of firm centralized leadership in such schools: at Lakeside, the head allowed the school to be dominated by pupils who were in essence bullies; his failing health is cited in mitigation, whilst at Farfield the principal is claimed to have presided over a far more coercive regime when the dominant pupils were seen to be less supportive of the formal regime.

This form of "co-option" can be seen to have a long and distinguished history in EBD residential schools when it is seen as a species of "self-government". Self-government, as was noted in the early chapters of this thesis (chapters 1 and 2), was one of four central tenets of the early pioneer workers in this field (Dawson, 1981), and it was reportedly still in use in 50% of the schools in England and Wales that took part in a national survey conducted by Dawson (1980) of current provision. Co-option relates to self-government in the sense that in both approaches the inmates of the institution are engaged in the decision making processes which go on in the institution. Self-government is a formalized system, whereby, through a number of different approaches (compare Wills's approach with that of Shaw, as described in chapter 2) pupils and staff meet together and formally discuss and legislate on matters relating to the community. Co-option is a more loosely defined situation in which pupils exercise considerable responsibility in particular areas, and are formally acknowledged for the contribution they make to the community (eg. through "helpers' treats" [chapter 5], or being employed as "top boss" [chapter 4]). The sorts of co-optive strategies

observed at work in the two fieldwork institutions, in many ways fall short of "self-government": areas of pupil responsibility are clearly limited by the hierarchical control of staff. However, the outcomes of what is here termed co-option and what is traditionally referred to as self-government are sought in the extent to which such practices promote self-discipline in pupils. Bridgeland (1971) sees self-government, as employed by the pioneers, as a tool for the development of self-discipline. Wilson and Evans (1980) also see this aim as a vital component of "good practice":

[...] there is a widely shared view that the ultimate aim is self-control and that the best kind of discipline is achieved not by uncritical acceptance of an autocratic regime but by a more democratic system in which pupils are given more responsibility for themselves and are kept informed and consulted [...] progressive freedom and responsibility should be essential features in the education of disturbed children. (p.165)

Rutter et al. (1979) also note, on the basis of a study of London comprehensive schools and their pupils, that levels of pupil deviance were in those schools where a high proportion of pupils were permitted to occupy positions of responsibility. These writers suggest that:

[...] giving children these responsibilities is likely to have benefits because it encourages trust in pupils' abilities and because it sets standards of mature behaviour. (p.197)

In line with the present findings, Rutter et al. suggest that the experience of exercising responsibility and the status that this confers may lead the pupil to reform his attitudes and redefine his view of himself. The self-esteem which derives from occupying a high status position encourages the actor to adopt patterns of behaviour which ensure the maintenance of this position.

Performing the script of the responsible leader of a group of peers, is not the only route to enhancement of individuals' self-images in the fieldwork schools of this study. As has already been shown, in some detail (chapters, 4, 5, and 6), re-signification is brought about by offering pupils a range of other areas in which they can achieve success. Thus in addition to their social performance, value is also placed on pupils' academic, practical or other personal strengths or potentialities. Pupils do not believe that they have to be academic high fliers in order to consider themselves to be "doing well" in the two fieldwork schools (chapter 6). Whilst academic progress is formally valued, it is only one of various areas of consideration which may be brought into play when progress is being considered. In both schools emphasis is placed on the involvement of pupils in practical tasks around the school buildings and grounds. The allocation of "jobs" at Lakeside was a far more formal affair than it was at Farfield. At Lakeside, all boys and staff as a matter of course were allocated practical tasks of routine maintenance. At Farfield "jobs" are the chief dominion of the "Joes" and carry high status and privileges. At Farfield the jobs tend to be of a lighter and more domestic nature than those at Lakeside. In both schools, the routine allocation of work tasks, which at Farfield sometimes entails supervision of other pupils, indicates to pupils that they are valued for individual contributions that they can make to the community, and encourages responsible behaviour as well as self-discipline.

The use of practical activities in therapeutic residential programmes for disturbed and delinquent individuals has a long and distinguished history. Progressive thinkers of the 19th century, such as

Mary Carpenter, proposed that the reform of delinquents through training was a constructive alternative to the simply punitive custodial sentences that such offenders tended to receive. This view was officially sanctioned as early as 1857 through the Industrial Schools Acts (Bridgeland, 1971). The purpose of such schools was essentially vocational, being based on the notion that poverty led to idleness, and that idleness led to delinquency. More recently this use of training has been noted in the English approved schools system (Dunlop, 1974; Millham et al., 1979). In the pioneering residential EBD schools of the 20th century the notion of the therapeutic value of manual labour was a subject of some disagreement. Neill (1968), himself an advocate of emphasising the personal and expressive functions of education in its broadest sense, through largely undirected activity of the pupil, states:

Books are the least important apparatus in a school. All that any child needs is the three R's; the rest should be tools and clay and paint and freedom. (p.38)

Neill, however, frowned upon the employment of pupils in manual jobs around schools, claiming:

[...] from the age of eight or nine until the age of nineteen or twenty, the desire to do manual labour of a dull kind is just not there. (p.66)

Wills, however, used manual labour as a central feature of the therapeutic regimes he ran for delinquent youths; as Bridgeland (1971) states with reference to Wills's work at the Hawkspur Camp:

Work was thought to develop not only the powers and abilities which would have vocational utility but also self-respect.

It expressed faith in the judgement of members, a feeling of community, an appreciation of the individual's contribution of effort and skill, and a sense of responsibility. (p.187)

It was essential to Wills, however, that such work take place within an environment that provides loving and caring surroundings to its inmates; where values of love, a belief in the essential goodness of man and the principles of self-government underpin the organization. Lennhoff (1966) echoes this view.

Like Neill, Wills saw many of his pupils as victims of essentially self-destructive urges, borne out of a lack of care and love in their early life experiences. Neill and Wills, as well as other pioneers such as Lyward, saw therapy for the battered self-images of these individuals as centring on the need for them to gain or sometimes regain control over their own lives. The residential community became the major tool in this process. This view is still held by some modern practitioners in the field, as Begg (1982) shows, in his account of a residential therapeutic community for EBD children:

[...] a boy may sit around all day, talking to people, playing the guitar or games, or he may want to play outside and no one will interfere with him. If he has not done his share of the chores it is likely to be his peers rather than the staff who will take him to task. (p.113)

Learning what one's "share of the chores" is, and that one's contribution is necessary is a vital aspect in the development of a healthy self-image. This simple recipe combines a sense of the degree to which the individual is valued by the individual's significant others, with a sense of the responsibilities that are entailed in a community of people. It has been

argued that this is a feature of both of the fieldwork schools, and forms a central component of the organizational structures of the two schools.

A further organizational strategy employed at Lakeside, which has the effect of incorporating pupils into the formal running of the school are the group and unit meetings, which take place on a regular basis. This type of strategy bears a close resemblance to the system of shared responsibility employed by Wills, and was featured in the schools of Neill, Shaw, Lyward and Lennhoff, as part of each pioneer's individual interpretation of "self-government"; it is also noted as an important feature in modern therapeutic communities for adolescents (Begg, 1982; Rose, 1978). Group meetings, as they are described by these practitioners, are depicted as the forum in which self-government is enacted, through the free discussion of events relating to the community, among staff and pupils, and exercise of power by this group in decision making in certain prescribed areas. At Lakeside, on the basis of pupils' perceptions, group and unit meetings deal with issues of concern in an open manner, and pupils feel free to participate and believe their contributions to be of importance. There are less of the connotations of courtroom and legislature, however, about the Lakeside meetings, than the pioneer writers suggest. This image of the Lakeside meetings, however, would seem to be in keeping with what the day to day concerns of such a community really are: the practical and prosaic demands of maintaining and organizing a community of 40 individuals on a large site. The meetings are clearly felt by the pupils to provide them with opportunities to raise matters that they believe to be of importance to the community. Decision making, the pupils believe, is often left finally in the hands of staff but the meetings

provide a channel of influence which the boys believe to be effective. In this sense the Lakeside and Farfield regimes contrast.

At Farfield, the group meetings tend to consist of presentations by the principal to the whole pupil group. Such meetings are not interactive - the pupils claim never to make voluntary contributions. Such meetings, therefore, cannot be seen in terms of fostering "incorporation" or "co-option". Once again, at Farfield, it is in the more intimate context of the interpersonal relationships between staff and boys that pupil concerns are voiced and considered. Thus the key worker system is the central organizational feature in this respect.

In this chapter it has been shown that the organizational patterns of the two schools contribute to the re-signification process by providing pupils with wider opportunities for participation in community life and the achievement of success than many have experienced in their former situations. There are opportunities to gain status positions and personal involvement in a variety of non-academic ways. This, it was suggested, contrasts strongly with what is understood of disaffection prone schools, where pupil participation is minimized by dictatorial and coercive management strategies, and where limited academic achievement equates with low status. It is suggested that pupils' all important esteem needs are being met in the fieldwork schools through various "co-option" and "incorporation" strategies, whereby pupils are valued for what they personally contribute to the community ("incorporation"), and are permitted an input into decision making processes ("co-option").

It is through the combination of thoughtful and caring relationships with staff, an organizational structure which encourages the fulfilment of pupils' esteem needs as well as a sense of responsibility to the community, that pupils develop a high level of commitment to their schools. This commitment is in turn reflected in the way in which many boys openly subscribe to the values espoused by the official persona of their schools. Some boys demonstrate sympathetic and altruistic attitudes to the other boys, and analyse their own behaviour in terms which place a high value on the ways in which they relate to other people. Many pupils claim to have rejected delinquency and delinquent associations. This latter outcome, it is suggested, is built upon the recognition that their esteem needs can be met in the more positive ways outlined here.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION: RESPITE, RELATIONSHIPS AND RE-SIGNIFICATION

It has been argued, chiefly on the basis of an analysis of pupils' perceptions of their residential school experience, that pupils in the two schools studied derived three major benefits from a period of residential education. These benefits can be summarized as:

1. *Respite* from the distressing situations which many encounter in their homes and schools, and as a consequence of delinquent peer group associations.
2. *Relationships* of a high quality with staff and fellow pupils in the residential community, which contribute to the development of more positive self-images by giving pupils a sense of being valued and cared for.
3. *Re-signification*, whereby pupils come to develop more positive self-images based on the effects of positive interpersonal relationships with staff, and the opportunities provided in the formal and informal organizational patterns of the schools for participation and personal success.

It has been argued that many of these pupils have come to value themselves more highly than previously, because the schools provide them with experiences which make them feel cared for and valued as individuals.

Of particular significance here is the contrast which exists between the pupils' experience of the fieldwork schools and their experience of mainstream schools. Close parallels were drawn between the

negative views of mainstream schools and teachers, held by the boys in the present study, and those of the subjects of other studies. It is suggested that these negative aspects of mainstream schooling are not uncommon, and may well be related to certain organizational and attitudinal factors present in some mainstream schools which are amenable to change in many ways. For this reason, the findings of the present study can be seen to contribute to the furtherance of our understanding of the ways in which deviant identities are constructed in mainstream schools, and to provide some pointers towards possible means of inhibiting this process. It is suggested that re-signification, whilst it is aided in the residential setting by conditions of respite from home, school and delinquent peers, embodies aims which are compatible with the mainstream situation. These aims involve the central significance which is apportioned to:

1. the quality of interpersonal relationships in the schools;
2. providing pupils with a wider range of opportunities for the achievement of success and positive recognition;
3. the encouragement of pupils to take opportunities to exercise responsibility and to voice opinions and feelings in the formal round of school life.

The outcome of this is to give pupils a sense of being both valued and cared for. Whilst this is not necessarily going to have bearing on the pupils' home lives, it will eliminate one possible area of stress in the pupils' personal worlds. If mainstream schools were to adopt these aims wholeheartedly the mainstream school might even become for some children a haven of respite from negative home and neighbourhood influences, instead of an arena in which such pressures become channelled into frustration and open conflict, as so often seems to happen.

In short, we have charted the ways in which a group of boys, labelled as having "Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties" have been able to develop relationships with significant others who have shown the boys that they are valuable individuals, in a situation which has allowed and encouraged them to make positive achievements. In receiving recognition for behaviour and achievements which do not support negative self-images, based on internalizations of the deviant images "significant others" have held of them in the past, the boys undergo a process of re-signification, whereby a positive self-image is constructed based on positive achievements. Bridgeland (1971), in referring to the work of the pioneer workers in this field, summarizes the way in which interpersonal relationships and organizational structure can be seen to work together to the positive benefit of the "maladjusted" individual:

Homer Lane, Makarenko, Wills, Barron, Marjorie Franklin and indeed many 'progressive' educationalists working with normal children have stressed the value of 'pioneering' experience through which children create and structure their own environment for living. This experience is thought to produce both individual self-esteem and respect for others and for the community [...]

The principle of shared responsibility is also seen as a fundamental part of the re-educative process. By sharing together with the staff the full responsibility of the management of their community, children are thought to share in something much more than exercises in decision making. They learn to accept the natural consequences of their own acts, and to value themselves as people who have something to contribute to the general good. (p.268)

"Pioneering experience" is not necessarily only concerned with living in log cabins and cooking on open fires. The daily round of often mundane practical tasks undertaken by Lakeside boys, and the jobs of the Farfield boys are a species of this. So too are the supervisory responsibilities of

some Farfield boys, as well as the sense, which seems to emerge from this, of mutual care and support shown by some boys for their peers. Similarly, "shared responsibility" features in both schools through the incorporation and co-option strategies that are identified. In a characteristically practical way David Wills (1971) summarizes, in uncompromising terms, the attitudes which he believes to be essential underpinnings of the "therapeutic approach":

1. never lose sight of the potentialities of any man;
2. respect him for his potentialities;
3. never despise anyone for not living up to his potentialities;
4. never be contemptuous of younger, smaller, stupider, weaker people, just for these things;
5. staff must, therefore, listen to pupils;
6. staff must encourage pupils to speak freely;
7. staff must accept what pupils have to say;
8. staff and pupils must be able to discuss things on frank and equal terms;
9. staff must take action, where necessary, on this basis;
10. there must be respect for the individual;
11. the essential worth of the human personality must always be recognized;
12. the rights of man must be observed. (pp.38-40)

These might well be termed the twelve commandments of child care. They would not be out of place in any school - special or mainstream, day or residential - either in the staffroom or in the pupils' common room. In essence this all boils down to the central importance of good quality

interpersonal relationships between staff and pupils and among pupils themselves. Wilson and Evans (1980) support this notion unequivocally:

[...] what matters most in the treatment of disturbed children is the quality of the relationships offered to them. (p.157)

This view is endorsed by Rutter (1975) in his assessment of the effects of different forms of treatment for "troubled children". It is also a view shared by A.S. Neill (Neill, 1968; Croall, 1983), who gradually abandoned psychotherapy at Summerhill in the face of the growing realization that the positive social and emotional development of his pupils was most effectively served by the experience of living in a caring and supportive community.

This thesis has attempted to take a view of the residential special school experience which has been hitherto greatly neglected, namely the pupils' perspective. In so doing we have found much to agree with in the writings of pioneer workers with EBD pupils. We have also been able to forge a compelling link between the work of these pioneers and the work of certain modern writers concerned with a sociological analysis of school disaffection (such as, Rutter et al., 1979; Schostak, 1982, 1983; Hargreaves, 1967; Hargreaves et al., 1975; Willis, 1978; L. Davies, 1984; Reynolds, 1976, 1979, 1984; Woods, 1984; Tattum, 1982; Cronk, 1987, and others). It is of particular interest that many of these more recently published writers have applied ethnographic approaches to the problems of disruption and disaffection in mainstream schools, and that, in so doing, they have identified factors in the organization and ethos of certain schools which can be seen to promote disaffection in pupils. In referring

to organizational and interpersonal arrangements in such schools, these writers echo many of the criticisms of mainstream schools, voiced many years earlier by pioneers such as Neill (1921, 1968), Wills, (1960), and Lyward (Burn, 1956). The present study, in reporting pupils' feelings of rejection, low status and marginality in accounts of their experience of mainstream schools, provides further evidence of the validity of these criticisms.

An important and relevant question which is outside the scope of the present study, is: what does such a study offer to the debate on the place of residential special schooling (EBD) in the range of help offered to those with special needs (see appendix VI for a brief consideration of this point). Topping (1983) sees the residential school as an "expensive luxury", of unproven effectiveness. Residential education is, undoubtedly, a relatively expensive form of schooling. Topping's search for proof of "effectiveness", however, leaves more questions unanswered than it answers. Topping suggests, on the basis of what he admits to be "very thin" (p.25) evidence, that pupils who are referred to residential schools (EBD) do not improve behaviourally, make limited academic progress, seldom return to mainstream schools and, at best, only improve at the same rate as children who experience no form of special intervention. The present study, however, shows repeatedly that pupils believe themselves to have made significant progress, socially, emotionally and behaviourally, and that they attribute these changes, often, to the quality of the experiences they have had in their residential schools: experiences which were often unavailable in other settings where they have been. Most significant is the fact that this study shows that a group of pupils, the majority of whom

have been considered - for one reason or another - ill-suited to placement in mainstream and day-special facilities, have become well integrated members of a school community, enjoyed positive relationships with adults and peers, and gained self-esteem from the knowledge that they are active and valued members of a community. Where comparisons are made it is clear that the residential experience has offered many of these boys opportunities for personal growth which were unavailable and often denied them, particularly in mainstream settings. For these reasons we must take issue with Topping's blanket dismissal of residential schooling.

In delineating the effects of residential schooling on a group of boys attending such schools, it has been the intention to shed light on a very shadowy area. It is not within the scope of the present study to enter into a debate as to the merits or demerits of residential schooling as opposed to facilities more integrated with the mainstream system. It is clear, however, that the two schools under consideration provided their pupils with settings and opportunities which promoted their positive development in a way that their home environments (including mainstream or local special day school/unit) often failed. An important aspect of this process was often, in fact, removal and consequent "respite" from negative home based circumstances. Thus whilst residential schooling of this type may certainly not be the only, the best or even most effective form of intervention possible, for pupils such as the boys of this study, it stands as a positive and enriching experience, which fulfilled important and neglected needs of these pupils. It might even be argued that if residential schooling of this type were to be considered less as a last resort and more as a valuable tool in a continuum of resources, as

envisaged by the Wagner committee (1988), then certain of its negative outcomes might be overcome. The social stigma, relatively limited educational provision, and loss of contact with family and peers, which are reported by some of the boys in this study as stemming from their attendance at residential schools, are the results of the isolation of residential schools from the mainstream of the pupils' home lives. The physical isolation, as has been noted, can supply pupils with much needed respite, but the isolation of these institutions from the mainstream of everyday life, which exists in the perceptions of some social work and education professionals, and (consequently) the laity, creates fears and mysteries which inhibit the necessary public and professional understanding of the nature and effects of such institutions. This prevents the interchanging of resources and expertise between the mainstream and residential sectors which would enrich and enhance both areas of the service. If the present study can offer any insights which contribute to this much needed informed understanding of residential special schools for EBD children, then it will have been worthwhile.

APPENDIX I
QUESTIONNAIRES USED IN THIS STUDY

Pupils' Questionnaire (I)

Name:

Age:

1. Write down the names of the boys you go around with most at this school. If you don't usually go around with anyone from this school write "none".
2. Who are the boys in this school who you like the most? (You may give up to 5 names.)
3. Who are the boys in this school who you dislike the most? (You may give up to 5 names.)
4. Overall, do you like being at this school? (tick) YES___ NO___
5. Do you prefer this school to other schools you have been to?
6. What are the things you like about this school?
7. What are the things you dislike about this school?
8. How many other schools have you been to as a pupil?
9. In what ways, if any, are the staff in this school any different from those you have known in other schools?
10. In what ways has the school changed (if at all) since you have been here?
11. Has the school changed (if at all) for the better? (tick) YES___NO___
12. Why are you at this school?
13. Did you choose to come to this school?
14. In what ways, if any, have you changed since being at this school?
15. In what ways, if any, has this school caused you to change?
16. In what ways, if any, has being at this school affected your home life?
17. What sort of ideas do you think people outside this school have about the school?

TICK THE "YES" OR "NO" BOX FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. IF YOU ARE NOT SURE OF THE ANSWER LEAVE THE QUESTION UNANSWERED.

18. Do teachers here usually give you enough help with your school work?
YES___NO___
19. If you wanted to speak to a member of staff about a personal problem would most of the staff here usually listen? YES___NO___
20. Are most of the teachers here friendly towards the pupils? YES___NO___
21. Are most of the care staff here friendly towards the pupils? YES___NO___
22. Are most of the domestic staff here friendly towards the pupils?
YES___NO___

FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS PLEASE PLACE A TICK BESIDE THE STATEMENTS WITH WHICH YOU AGREE.

23. If you were at a comprehensive school you would be making better progress —
24. The school work at this school is too easy —
25. If you had a personal problem whilst you were at school you would (usually):
- (a) talk about it to one or some of the teachers —
 - (b) " " care staff —
 - (c) " " domestic staff —
 - (d) " the head master —
 - (e) " another boy —
 - (f) " someone outside the school —
 - (g) keep it to yourself —
 - (h) not do any of the things listed above —
26. Put a tick next to the people listed below who are usually the most helpful to you when you have a personal problem:
- (a) teachers —
 - (b) care staff —
 - (c) domestic staff —
 - (d) other boys —
 - (e) head master —
 - (f) someone else —
27. What changes, if any, would you like to see in the school?

PUPILS' QUESTIONNAIRE (II)

1. How old are you? ____

Put a tick next to the statements that you believe are true.

Put a cross next the statements which you think are not true.

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 2. This school is better than an ordinary primary school | ___ |
| 3. This school is better than an ordinary comprehensive school | ___ |
| 4. This school is better than a day special school | ___ |
| 5. Most pupils at this school are happier here than they were when they were at other schools | ___ |
| 6. Pupils here like this school because the staff here are more friendly than the staff in ordinary day schools | ___ |
| 7. Pupils here like this school because teachers give them more help with their school work than teachers in ordinary schools | ___ |
| 8. Pupils here like this school because the staff here listen to pupils when pupils want to talk to them | ___ |
| 9. The staff here help pupils if they have a personal problem | ___ |
| 10. The staff here give pupils more personal attention than staff in ordinary schools | ___ |
| 11. The staff here are more understanding than staff in ordinary schools | ___ |
| 12. The staff here are more bossy than staff in ordinary schools | ___ |
| 13. The staff here are not as bossy as staff in ordinary schools | ___ |
| 14. This school is better than ordinary schools because pupils do jobs here | ___ |
| 15. You don't have to be good at school work to do well here | ___ |
| 16. Your behaviour is more important than your school work here | ___ |
| 17. Most pupils at this school want to do well here | ___ |
| 18. To do well here you have to try to get on well with staff | ___ |
| 19. To do well here you have to try to get on well with the other pupils | ___ |
| 20. To do well here you have to show that you can be trusted | ___ |
| 21. To do well here you have to do well in your school work | ___ |
| 22. To do well here you have to try to do your jobs well | ___ |
| 23. One of the bad things about being here is that people outside the school think that it is a place for bad or strange people | ___ |
| 24. One of the bad things about being here is that you don't see your family very often | ___ |
| 25. One of the bad things about being here is that you lose touch with your friends at home | ___ |
| 26. One of the good things about being here is that it gives you a break from being at home | ___ |

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE (I)

1. Name_____ Job Title_____
2. Age: 25-30___; 26-35___; 36-40___; 41-45___; 46-50___; 51-55___; 55+
3. Please give a brief account, in chronological order, of the types of institutions in which you have worked in your career.
4. What are the major differences (if any) between this institution and others in which you have worked previously, in terms of ethos, management expectations etc., or any other areas which you feel to be important.
5. Do you enjoy working here? Give reasons for your answer.
6. What, in your view, are the major aims of the school?
7. What effect do you hope to have on the pupils here?
8. Outline areas in which you feel the school succeeds, and areas in which you feel the school fails.
9. Do you feel that it is possible to categorize the pupils who attend this school in any way? If so, please outline the categories. If you have any other views on the notion of categorization please state them.
10. What do residential schools in general, and this one in particular, have to offer pupils?
11. In what ways has this school changed since you have been here? Have these changes been for the better or worse?
12. What changes, if any, would you like to see made in the school and its policies?
13. Do you have any say in policy making in the school? If so, give examples, if not, comment on how you feel about this situation.
14. Please comment on what you feel to be the quality of the following:
 - (a) inter-staff relationships
 - (b) staff-pupil relationships
 - (c) inter-pupil relationships

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE (II)

Job Title_____

Below is a list of aims which a school like yours might have for its pupils. Please number these items in order of what you feel to be their importance. Place "1" next to the most important item.

- (a) The re-integration of pupils into their local schools _____
- (b) The re-integration of pupils into their home situations _____
- (c) The preparation of pupils for the world of work _____
- (d) Aiding pupils' academic development _____
- (e) Aiding pupils' social and emotional development _____

APPENDIX II
PUPILS' RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE (I), QUESTIONS 18-26

QUESTION	NO. OF RESPONSES		
	Farfield N=31	Lakeside N=13	Tot. N=44
18. Do teachers here usually give you enough help with your school work?	YES: 30 NO: 2	11 0	41 2
19. If you wanted to speak to a member of staff about a personal problem, would most of the staff here usually listen?	YES: 25 NO: 6	11 2	36 8
20. Are most of the teachers here friendly towards pupils?	YES: 27 NO: 5	12 2	39 7
21. Are most of the care staff here friendly towards pupils?	YES: 29 NO: 3	13 0	42 3
22. Are most of the domestic staff here friendly towards the pupils?	YES: 32 NO: 0	12 1	44 1
INDICATING AGREEMENT			
23. If you were at a comprehensive school you would be making better progress in your school work	17	5	22
24. The school work here is too easy	15	4	19
25. If you had a personal problem whilst you were at school you would (usually):			
(a) talk about it to one or some of the teachers	12	6	18
(b) talk about it to one or some of the care staff	21	8	29
(c) talk about it to one or some of the domestic staff	4	3	7
(d) talk about it to the head master	13	4	17
(e) talk about it to another boy	13	3	16
(f) talk about it with someone outside the school	6	2	8
(g) keep it to yourself	8	1	9
(h) not do any of the things listed above	1	2	3
26. Put a tick next to the people listed below who are usually the most helpful to you when you have personal problems:			
(a) teachers	14	5	19
(b) care staff	22	8	30
(c) domestic staff	4	3	7
(d) other boys	12	3	15
(e) head master	8	4	12
(f) someone else	7	1	8

APPENDIX III
PUPILS' RESPONSES TO PUPILS' QUESTIONNAIRE (II)

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES		
	FARFIELD N=33	LAKE SIDE N=24	TOTAL N=57
2. This school is better than an ordinary primary school.	YES: 28 NO: 5	13 11	41 16
3. This school is better than an ordinary comprehensive school.	YES: 28 NO: 5	14 10	42 15
4. This school is better than a day special school.	YES: 29 NO: 4	13 11	42 15
5. Most of the pupils at this school are happier here than they were at other schools.	YES: 24 NO: 9	16 7	40 16
6. Pupils here like this school because the staff here are more friendly than the staff in ordinary day schools.	YES: 28 NO: 5	21 2	49 7
7. Pupils here like this school because the teachers here give them more help with their schoolwork than teachers in ordinary schools.	YES: 27 NO: 6	22 2	49 8
8. Pupils here like this school because the staff here listen to pupils when pupils want to talk to them.	YES: 28 NO: 5	23 1	51 6
9. The staff here help pupils if they have a personal problem.	YES: 26 NO: 6	23 1	49 7
10. The staff here give pupils more personal attention than staff in ordinary schools.	YES: 30 NO: 3	20 4	50 7
11. The staff here are more understanding than staff in ordinary schools.	YES: 30 NO: 3	22 2	52 5
12. The staff here are more bossy than staff in ordinary schools.	YES: 8 NO: 25	3 17	11 42
13. The staff here are not as bossy as staff in ordinary schools.	YES: 23 NO: 10	17 1	40 11
14. This school is better than an ordinary school because pupils do jobs here.	YES: 22 NO: 11	10 13	32 24
15. You don't have to be good at school work to do well here.	YES: 28 NO: 4	19 5	47 9

16. Your behaviour is more important than your school work here.	YES: 21 NO: 11	17 6	38 17
17. Most pupils at this school want to do well here.	YES: 32 NO: 1	21 1	53 2
18. To do well here you have to try to get on well with staff.	YES: 26 NO: 7	19 5	45 12
19. To do well here you have to try to get on well with the other pupils.	YES: 27 NO: 6	22 2	49 8
20. To do well here you have to show that you can be trusted.	YES: 28 NO: 5	24 0	52 5
21. To do well here you have to do well in your school work.	YES: 25 NO: 7	16 8	41 15
22. To do well here you have to try to do your jobs well.	YES: 23 NO: 10	18 6	41 16
23. One of the bad things about being here is that people outside the school think that it is a place for bad or strange people.	YES: 19 NO: 14	18 6	37 20
24. One of the bad things about being here is that you don't see your family very often.	YES: 21 NO: 12	16 8	37 20
25. One of the bad things about being here is that you lose touch with your friends at home.	YES: 21 NO: 11	20 4	41 15
26. One of the good things about being here is that it gives you a break from being at home.	YES: 21 NO: 10	13 11	34 21

APPENDIX IV
STAFF PERCEPTIONS

There follows a breakdown and brief analysis of staff responses to two questionnaires (see appendix I) designed to elicit their perceptions of the two fieldwork schools.

QUESTIONNAIRE I

Number of questionnaire returns: Farfield: 14; Lakeside: 2; total: 16

Q3 Types of institutions worked in formerly by Lakeside and Farfield staff:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------|
| (a) | mainstream and special schools | 5 staff |
| (b) | mainstream schools only | 4 staff |
| (c) | special school only | 2 staff |
| (d) | institution of higher education | 1 staff |
| No. respondents: 12 | | N=12 |

Q4 Major differences between present and previous institutions:

Category of response	number of responses
(a) non-academic emphasis of present school	4
(b) closer staff-pupil relationships in present school	4
(c) more caring environment in present school	3
(d) pupils are given more responsibility in present school	1
(e) smaller class sizes in present school	1
(f) present institution is more effective in solving pupils' problems	1
(g) happier atmosphere in present school	1
No. respondents: 12	N=15

Q5 Do you enjoy working here? Give reasons for your answer.

Yes: 14 ; No: 0

Reasons:

- | | | |
|---------------------|--|--------------|
| (a) | Good relationships among staff | 12 responses |
| (b) | Good staff-pupil relationships | 10 " |
| (c) | More stressful work, but more enjoyable than working in mainstream schools | 1 " |
| No. respondents: 14 | | N=23 |

Q6 Staff perceptions of the major aims of the school.

Category of response	number of responses
(a) to provide pupils with a stable and caring environment	9
(b) to promote the educational development of pupils	5
(c) to solve EBD	4
(d) to make a financial profit	4
(e) re-integration of pupils into their families	3
(f) to improve pupils' level of happiness	2
(g) re-integration of pupils into mainstream schools	1
(h) to prepare pupils for life after school	1
No. respondents: 14	N= 29

Q7 What effect do you hope to have on the pupils here (at this school)?

Category of response	number of responses
(a) to provide a positive social model for pupils	6
(b) to counsel pupils with personal difficulties and to listen to them	5
(c) to promote pupils' happiness and wellbeing whilst they are at the school	4
(d) to establish trusting, caring relationships with pupils	4
(e) to aid pupils in their academic and social development	2
(f) to show pupils they are likeable	1
No. respondents: 14	N= 22

Q8 Areas in which school is perceived to succeed and fail.

Category of response	number of responses
areas of success	
(a) the promotion of good social relationships throughout the school	6
(b) the creation of a secure environment	2
(c) the re-integration of pupils into their family homes	2
(d) promoting pupils' self-esteem	1
(e) containment and control of pupils	1
	N= 12
areas of failure	
(a) poor staff-management relations	4
(b) poor quality of academic programme	3
(c) re-integration of pupils into their families	1
(d) re-integration of pupils into mainstream schools	1
(e) failure to make significant impact on pupils' home based difficulties	1
No. respondents: 13	N= 10

Q9 Categorization of pupils/ attitudes to categorization.

Category of response	number of responses
(a) Pupils have EBD	6
(b) Pupils are ESN/ have MLD	2
(c) Pupils have Social, Emotional and behavioural difficulties	1
(d) Pupils have family difficulties	1
(e) Pupils are delinquent	1
	N= 11

Attitudes to categorization:

categorization is invalid, because it leads to stereotyping	6
categorization is useful for bureaucratic purposes	1
No. respondents: 13	N= 7

Q10 Perceptions of what residential schools have to offer to pupils.

category of response	number of responses
(a) respite from family and other	9
(b) care, stability, security	5
(c) good relationships with adults	2
(d) educational improvement	2
(e) opportunities to succeed and improve levels of self esteem	2
No. respondents: 13	N= 20

Q11 Perceived changes in the school, and the quality of change, for better or worse.

category of response	number of responses
changes for the better	
(a) improved material resource	6
(b) improved home-school liaison	3
changes for the worse	
(a) more formality in staff-management relations	5
(b) increased pupil numbers	5
(c) increased staff stress	1
No. respondents: 13	N= 20

Q12 Changes staff would like to see made in their school and its policies.

category of response	number of response
(a) better staff-management relations	5
(b) improvements in educational standards	3
(c) lower pupil numbers	3
(d) more sharing of responsibility among the staff	2
(e) less report writing	2
No. respondents: 12	N= 15

Q13 Perception of role in policy making in the school, and comments on policy making procedures.

Only Fairfield staff replied to this question.

Only the head of education and the deputy head of care claimed to have any limited input into policy making in the school.

2 RSW's claimed to have decision making power with regard to individual pupils.

2 staff members claimed to be unconcerned about their level of involvement in this situation.

6 staff members expressed dissatisfaction with the authoritarian style of the school principal.

No. respondents: 12

Q14 Staff perceptions of the quality of social relationships in their school.

Category of response	number of responses
(i) Staff relationships	
(a) good lateral relationships, poor vertical relationships	13
(b) "strained and bitter"	1
(ii) Staff-pupil relationships	
(a) very good, characterized by mutual trust and care	10
(b) relationships take the place of formal discipline often	1
(c) occasional use of corporal punishment should stop	1
(d) there is room for improvement	1
(e) this situation is difficult to assess at present owing to changes in the school	1
(iii) Pupil relationships	
(a) happy and harmonious mostly	5
(b) weak and unstable mostly	3
(c) too much bullying	3
(d) bullying has recently decreased	2
No. respondents: 13	N= 41

QUESTIONNAIRE II

Number of returns: Lakeside, 11 ; Fairfield, 15 ; total, 26

Below is a list of aims which a school like yours might have for its pupils. Please number the items in order of what you feel to be their importance. Place a "1" beside the most important item.

- (a) the re-integration of pupils into their local schools =4
- (b) the re-integration of pupils into their home situations 2
- (c) the preparation of pupils for the world of work =4
- (d) aiding pupils' academic development 3
- (e) aiding pupils' social and emotional development 1

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF THE STAFF QUESTIONNAIRES

The findings of the staff questionnaire were not incorporated into the main body of the thesis for two major reasons. Firstly, the thesis is concerned chiefly with pupils' perceptions of their schools, and secondly, whilst the staff at Farfield school were open and willing to participate fully in the research, many of the Lakeside staff were reluctant to discuss matters relating to the staff group. This is reflected in the number of returns of questionnaire I (Farfield, 12 returns; Lakeside, 2 returns). The writer gathered the impression, after spending some time at Lakeside, that there was a high degree of interpersonal conflict among the staff there. This conflict appeared to relate to the departure of the former head master, and to various disagreements relating to the new head's style of management. This conflict was also reflected in the pupil sample (see chapter 5), but did not serve to inhibit the pupils in their responses to the researcher; the staff, however, were inhibited. The returns of the 2nd questionnaire were much better (Lakeside, 11; Farfield, 15), though the scope of this questionnaire is much narrower than the first. With these limitations in mind, the following analysis of responses to the questionnaire attempts to delineate a picture of staff perceptions of their schools, and must be seen as pertaining almost entirely to the views of the Farfield staff. All of the full-time teachers (7), and 5 (not including the principal) of the 9 RSV's returned questionnaires.

The vast majority of respondents (9) had had experience of mainstream education prior to working at Farfield (Q3); this included the majority (3/5) of the RSW's who responded. Differences described between present and former places of work are notable for the positive light in which they place the fieldwork schools (Q4). The quality of staff-pupil relationships is seen to be better in the fieldwork schools, and the school is seen to offer pupils a "more caring" environment. Pupils are believed to be happier, and their problems are seen to be dealt with more effectively than in other institutions experienced by staff. More neutral responses are: "the non academic emphasis" of the present school, and "smaller class sizes". In the light of the positive stress that is placed on staff-pupil relationships, individual attention and pupil satisfaction, however, these would appear to denote positive responses.

Staff who returned the questionnaire, like pupils, tended to share a very positive attitude towards their schools (Q5). Once again, it is the quality of social relationships between staff and boys, as well as among staff that are cited as factors contributing significantly to satisfaction.

The dominant aims (Q6) of the schools were perceived by respondents to be: to provide pupils with a stable and caring environment; to promote pupils' educational development and to alleviate pupils' emotional and behavioural difficulties. Making a financial profit was also a prominent aim perceived by staff in the Farfield sample. The re-integration of pupils into their home situations was also noted as an important aim (3/14). Once again, although instrumental factors such as

educational development are seen to be of importance, the stress is placed on the affective development of pupils.

In commenting on their personal contributions to pupil development in the schools (Q7), the respondents speak mainly in terms of the quality of the interpersonal relationships they share with pupils. They aim to provide positive social models to pupils; to promote pupils' personal happiness and sense of wellbeing; to counsel pupils experiencing difficulties and to establish trusting, caring relationships with pupils. Academic development is again mentioned to a lesser degree than these affective concerns.

Where the quality of staff-pupil relationships are concerned, respondents believe their school (Farfield) to be succeeding (Q8). However, dissatisfaction is expressed with the academic programme of the school. There is also dissatisfaction among the junior staff with their relations with management staff. The school's performance in securing the re-integration of pupils into their home situations is the subject of conflicting views, considered by one staff member as an area of failure, and by another as an area of success.

When asked to "categorize" their pupils (Q9), the staff obliged by providing a list of formal labels, including EBD, ESN and MLD, social and familial difficulties were also mentioned. The most cited term was EBD. However, a significant number (7/13) of respondents declared a distrust of such categorizations, and indicated an appreciation of the potentially negative consequences of labelling of this kind.

Consistent with responses to earlier questions (4-9), respondents stressed the affective needs of children when asked to consider what residential schools might have to offer pupils (Q10). Respite from home based difficulties was the most commonly cited item (9/12), whilst care, stability and security were collectively the second most commonly cited (5/12). Once more, the quality of adult-child relationships was mentioned, as well as educational and self-image improvement.

Where matters of policy formulation are concerned, staff believe themselves (at Farfield) to have little input (Q13). The principal at Farfield is depicted here very much as a dictator. This is a source of dissatisfaction to some staff, who see the poor quality of staff-management relations in the school as a major flaw. It is clear that a perceived increase in pupil numbers (Q's 11 and 12) is also a related source of dissatisfaction.

The responses to the final question (Q14) echo much of what has gone before. The one Lakeside respondent indicates negativity in staff relationships, but finds staff-pupil relationships to be good; this respondent is uncertain about pupil relationships. From the Farfield sample strong satisfaction is indicated at the high quality of staff relationships and staff-pupil relationships, but staff-management relationships are shown to be strained. Mutuality of trust and caring between staff and boys emerges as an important category of response to this question. Pupil relationships are the subject of some disagreement. Whilst 5 staff indicate general happiness and harmony in relationships among the boys, 7 staff indicate problems of "stability" and "bullying".

Responses to the final question, along with earlier responses, create a picture of staff perceptions which emphasizes the importance attached to, and the success achieved in forging good quality, supportive and caring relationships between the staff and boys. Staff place a higher priority on pupils' social and emotional development than on academic performance. The only major area of dissatisfaction appears to relate to staff-management relations.

The above findings were also tested in a second, much briefer and focused questionnaire (Questionnaire II), which required staff to rank order, according to perceived importance, a list of items relating to the aims of residential special schools (EBD) (see above). The response to this questionnaire was much better than that achieved by the first questionnaire. The final rank orderings, achieved by combining the findings from both schools' staff groups, were as follows:

- 1st aiding pupils' social and emotional development
- 2nd the re-integration of pupils into their home situations
- 3rd aiding pupils' academic development
- =4th re-integration of pupils into their home based schools
- =4th the preparation of pupils for the world of work.

These findings support the overall contention of this thesis, that the two schools under consideration place paramount significance on the positive personal development of their pupils, not to the exclusion of instrumental goals, but with instrumental goals being to seen to be of secondary importance.

APPENDIX V
SOME PARENTAL VIEWS

This section reports the perceptions of parents who have children attending a residential school for children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. The sample of parents whose perceptions are dealt with here had children attending Farfield school at the time of the study reported in the main body of this thesis.

Parents' perceptions of the school, their degree of satisfaction with the school, and its effects on their children were sought through a postal questionnaire (details of the questions asked appear at the end of this section). The parents were questioned about the following areas:

the appropriateness of their sons' placement at the school
their satisfaction with the amount of information they received
their satisfaction with the degree of contact with the school
their satisfaction with the quality of services provided by the school
changes they have observed in their sons
changes they wish to see in their sons
improvements they would like to see in the school's services
general remarks they would like to make about the school.

The school roll, at the time of sending out the questionnaires (March, 1985), stood at 45. Thirty-six questionnaires were sent out, 16 were returned.

BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES

Q1(1). *In your opinion is this school the right place for your son?*

YES	NO
-----	----

14	2
----	---

Q1(11) Of the two parents who thought that the school was not the right place for their sons, one gave no reason for the reply, the other gave their son's lack of appetite as a reason. The remaining 9 parents who gave responses to this question felt that the school was of positive benefit to their sons' by facilitating improvements in specific areas of their sons' development. These areas included educational progress and behaviour. Three parents saw the school as being a last resort for their sons, which had, fortunately, proved successful:

It's the only place where John has ever shown any improvement. Psychiatrists hadn't given much hope for his future before he moved to Farfield. [parents of boy of 13.6]

It has done him good. I am glad as it was a last resort.
[parents of a boy of 16.2]

Other typical responses included:

Because he has got down to some real work and has become more sensible. [Parents of a boy of 16.3]

Since being at Farfield Adrian has matured as a person. The school has given him security - he knows his boundaries there.
[parents of a boy of 14.3]

Q2(1). *Do you feel you receive enough information from the school about:*

	YES	NO
(a) what goes on at the school	11	5
(b) your son's educational progress	16	0
(c) your son's behaviour at school	14	2
(d) the school's aims	12	4
(e) the school's methods	10	5
(f) school activities	13	4
(g) school holidays	14	1
	Mean=13	3

Answering yes to all categories: 7

Answering no to all categories: 2

Q2(i1). *Would you like to have more information about any aspects of the school, or your son's progress?*

7 questionnaires were returned with requests for further information in the following areas:

- academic prospects of son
- projected length of stay of son at school
- health matters
- behaviour of son in school (2)
- methods of dealing with bad behaviour
- educational aims of the school
- weekend activities at the school
- attitudes of the boys towards one another

Q3. *Do you feel you have enough contact with the school?*

YES NO

12 2

Q4(1). *Are you satisfied with the service provided by this school?*

YES NO

15 1

Q4(11). *Please give any suggestions as to ways you feel the services could be improved.*

Whilst the overwhelming majority of parents expressed satisfaction with the services provided, 6 parents indicated ways in which the services might be improved. Two respondents expressed a desire for increased contact with the school for the purposes of discussing their sons' progress with staff. Another parent suggested that an open day or sports day should be instituted to which parents could be invited. There was also a request that pupils be encouraged by the school to take up hobbies and to become involved in community activities. Another parent asked for more work to be done to improve his son's behaviour. One parent, whose son had recently left, stated that she would have preferred greater emphasis to have been placed on her son's academic development in his final year at the school, in preference to what she saw as an over emphasis on work experience. A request for homework for his son during the holidays, was made by one parent. Another parent requested that her son be encouraged to write home weekly.

Q.5(1). *Have you noticed any changes in your son since he has been at Farfield, in any of the following areas:*

	YES	NO
(a) his general behaviour	13	3
(b) his behaviour towards you	11	4
(c) his attitudes	10	6
(d) his attitudes or behaviour towards other children	7	8

14 respondents indicated some change in their sons.

2 respondents indicated no change in their sons.

6 respondents identified changes in all 4 areas.

Q5(11). *If you have noticed any changes in your son, please state what they are and if they have been for the better or worse.*

There were 15 responses to this question.

11 stated that changes had been for the better.

4 indicated that no change had taken place.

No respondents stated that their sons had changed for the worse.

Areas of improvement mentioned were:

more friendly (4 responses)

greater maturity (4)

easier to communicate with (3)

greater tolerance for others (3)

increased self-control (2)

calmer (2)

improved appetite (1)

improved ability to amuse himself (1)

Q5(iii). *Do you find your son:*

	No. agreeing
(a) easier to get on with	11
(b) more difficult to get on with	0
(c) no different	4

Q5(iv). *In what ways is he easier or more difficult to get on with?*

Areas of improvement indicated by the 10 respondents to this question were:

boy's greater control of temper (3 responses)

boy's increased maturity (3)

better son-parent communication (2)

less selfishness by boy (2)

more respect for parents (1)

improved table manners (1)

Q5(v). *Please list any changes you would like to see in your son.*

13 respondents listed desirable changes. These were:

improved son-parent communication (5)

greater maturity (2)

greater calmness (2)

more definite aims in life (1)

greater self-confidence (1)

less swearing (1)

specific educational improvements (1)

improved "manners" (1)

improved appetite (1)

greater regard for others (1)

interest in a hobby (1)

more desire by son to go home at weekends and in holidays (1)

improved general behaviour (1)

Q6. *Further comments.*

There were 10 responses to this item.

6 were concerned with describing unsatisfactory aspects of their sons' behaviour. These were:

unresponsiveness

argumentativeness

destructiveness

inability to accept criticism

poor sibling relationship

lack of respect for mother.

Many of these parents (5), however, stated that in spite of the presence of such problems, they felt great confidence in the school, and were impressed by the improvements they believed it to have helped achieve in their sons. One parent indicated a preference for face to face meetings with school staff as opposed to filling in a questionnaire.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It must be emphasised that the 45% (N=36) return rate achieved by this questionnaire is somewhat poor, leaving the remaining 55% as representative of a significant, unknown and possibly contrary subset of opinion. The conclusions, therefore, should be taken with this limitation in mind.

Responses to questions 1-4 indicate a high level of satisfaction with the school and its services, among respondents. Responses to question 1(ii) indicate that parents value the school for the beneficial effects it has had on their sons' development, particularly in social and behavioural terms. This positive attitude is also reflected in responses to question 6. Responses to question 2(i), however, indicate that a substantial proportion of parents wish to see improvements in the degree of information provided to parents about the school, its aims, methods and activities. Parents show a keen desire to contribute ideas of ways to improve the services offered by the school (Q.4ii).

A large majority of parents perceive changes for the better to have taken place in their sons, since they have been pupils at Farfield

(5i-v), in their general behaviour, attitudes to parents and other children. No parents indicated that their sons' behaviour had deteriorated since being at the school. A high proportion of parents found their sons easier to get along with, since being at the school. Parents were still keen to see further improvements in many of their children along the same lines.

The most important outcomes of this brief study are the high degree of parental satisfaction with the school, and the indication that they share common ground with the therapeutic endeavours of the school. Parental interest in becoming more closely involved in the activities of the school, and the desire to be better informed about the school suggest a supportive attitude to the school and indicate possible avenues for future development in the area of parental involvement.

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 1(i) In your opinion is Farfield the right place for your son ? YES/NO
- (ii) Give reasons for your answer.
- 2(i) Do you feel you receive enough information from the school about:
- (a) what goes on at the school YES/NO
 - (b) your son's educational progress at school
 - (c) your son's behaviour at school
 - (d) the school's aims
 - (e) the school's methods
 - (f) school activities
 - (g) school holidays
- (ii) would you like to have more information about any aspect of the school or your son's progress?
3. Do you feel you have enough contact with the school? YES/NO
- 4(i) Are you satisfied with the services provided by the school? YES/NO
- (ii) Please give any suggestions as to ways you feel the services could be improved.
- 5(i) Have you noticed any changes in your son, since he has been at Farfield in:
- (a) his general behaviour YES/NO
 - (b) his behaviour towards you
 - (c) his attitudes
 - (d) his attitudes or behaviour towards other children
- (ii) If you have noticed any changes in your son, please state what they are and if they have been for the better or worse.
- (iii) Do you find your sons EASIER or MORE DIFFICULT to get on with since he has been a pupil at Farfield?
- (iv) In what ways is he easier or more difficult to get on with?
- (v) Please give changes (if any) you would like to see in your son.
6. Please use this space to make any further comments you have about the school, the effect it has on your son, your relationship with your son, or any other matters you feel to be of importance.

APPENDIX VI

ARE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS NECESSARY?

In this section the writer briefly extends the scope of the study reported in this thesis, in order to suggest something of the wider significance of residential special schools (EBD), in relation to community based alternative forms of provision. Questions are also raised as to the practicalities and pitfalls of introducing necessary reforms into mainstream schools which might help to overcome some of the school based difficulties which are often associated with EBD in schools.

One of the most compelling challenges to residential provision for EBD children is provided by Holman (1981), who advocates a community based approach to these problems. Holman organized and ran "the Bath Community Child Care Project" on a severely socially deprived council estate. After three years Holman claimed that the project had succeeded in preventing some children from entering long term residential care. Methods employed by Holman resound with echoes of the present study. Holman's methods included: the setting up of a number of clubs for the youngsters of the area, with an emphasis on the co-option of the youngsters into the running of the clubs; providing an "open door" at his home for children and their families, on, what appears to have been, a 24 hours 7-day-a-week basis. Holman writes with something of the zeal of Neill and Wills, and reveals the central significance of his personal dedication to the project. In spite of the overall success of the venture, he also admits to there having been many setbacks in the progress of the project, which at times

seemed to be rejected by those at whom it was aimed. Holman describes the way in which he and his small team had to accept these setbacks as they went through the painful process of trying to find out the specific needs of their clients.

Reliance on the personal qualities of individuals to provide such a vital service would seem to be an unavoidable demand that must be made. This alone, however, is not enough, as Cole (1986) points out:

If social services and education departments could unite to provide effective non-residential alternatives, bringing practical help into the overtaxed family's home on a national scale, providing direct training perhaps using behaviourist methods for parents and children, or organizing extended evening, weekend and holiday IT programmes geared to meet individual needs, then many fewer children from families under stress would need the help offered by residential education. Similarly, if professional fostering schemes could be substantially extended, demand might also slacken. (p.36)

Cole goes on to say, however, that he is doubtful that these conditions will be met in the near future. It is clear, at the present time, that family intervention of a behaviourist type is underway in certain locations, (eg. Shuttleworth, 1983, 1986; Dowling and Osborne, 1985; Gill, 1989), taking the form of individual, family therapy and groupwork. Conventional clinic-based child guidance and psychiatric services are known to be ineffective in eliciting the involvement of large numbers of the families targeted as being in need of their services, leading to the growing realization of the need for "outreach services" (Taylor and Dowling, 1986). The present study would tend to suggest that effective community or family centred intervention was not a feature of these pupils'

experience. Many pupils, in fact, felt that they were threatened and undermined by their family experiences. Only after a period of time spent separated from their families did the pupils feel ready to resume contact. This view is supported by the views of some of the parents at Farfield (see appendix V). Respite from the home situation, in these circumstances, became a vital feature of the residential experience for many of these children, and respite from the disorder and conflict which surrounded these children at home was valuable to the families also (appendix V).

Respite is a key factor, which contributes to the effectiveness of the residential experience for the pupils in this study. In the absence of properly co-ordinated educational, community and family centred approaches it is difficult to see how non-residential approaches, such as Intermediate Treatment programmes, alone can be effective in the face of adverse environmental influences which, inevitably, conflict with the efforts of such programmes. Intermediate Treatment programmes alone, as Cole (1986) points out, only occupy their clients for a few hours per week, whilst these other influences have the advantage of a greater allocation of time as well the power of habit at their disposal. The residential setting tackles both of these problems.

Another major area of difficulty from which the residential schools of this study offer their pupils respite, is that of mainstream schooling. This setting, it has been shown, can often be an adverse influence on pupils' levels of involvement in school life, and, it is argued, is an area where positive structural change is notoriously

difficult to achieve. There is evidence to support the view that some mainstream schools seek to involve all of their pupils; where personal development is considered as vital to each child as academic development (Rutter et al., 1979; Reynolds, 1976, 1979, 1984). The importance of these efforts in the prevention of disaffection among pupils and in the development of positive self-images among pupils has been stressed throughout this thesis (chapters 1, 8, 9). The research which indicates these positive effects of schooling is presented alongside evidence of what Schostak (1982) has called "the black side of schooling". That is the tendency among some schools to deliberately differentiate between pupils in a discriminatory way, to offer rewards to a small elite of pupils and to mark others with low status. Writers such as Schostak (1982, 1983, 1987), Hargreaves (1967), Hargreaves et al. (1975), Sharp and Green (1975), Hemming (1980), Lawrence et al. (1984) and Reid (1985), have all contributed strongly to this view of schools, indicating that this situation, whilst not irreversible, is a tendency which is borne out of practices and values which are well established in English education. Writers such as Hemming, Schostak, Sharp and Green, Willis (1978), Apple (1980), and Holly (1973, 1974) relate these practices and values to the values of the society which schools serve. It is suggested by these writers, that the production of an underclass of school "failures" is an unacknowledged but necessary function of schooling in our present society. This view is often cited by those who have written about the resistance with which attempts to reform the education process have met.

A recent history of mainstream education in England should contain a number of accounts of and by teachers who have attempted to bring

to mainstream schools some of the values which we have noted as underlying the work of the "pioneer" workers in the EBD field. Notable among these is R.F. Mackenzie (1970) who acknowledges directly a debt to the work of The Forest School, a residential community which operated between 1929 and 1938. The Forest school was characterized, according to van der Eyken and Turner (1975) by:

no formal classes, no standard discipline [...] The children could attend classes if they wished, but if they were not interested in the subject, or in any school work on a particular day [...] no pressure was put on them to attend lessons. The school staff, who were labourers as much as teachers, were looked upon as group leaders, encouraging adventures and activities rather than prescribed courses of study. (p.138)

It was a school which attempted to integrate all aspects of the living into its pupils' educational programme. The pupils were engaged in a form of self-government through the school council, and are described as having worked alongside staff on maintenance tasks around the school; the pupils' direct experience of the forest environment formed the core of much of their learning. Mackenzie took from his experience of The Forest School the belief that schools should tailor their educational programmes to the needs of their pupils, and that this should start with the curriculum being firmly based on the pupils' needs, which inevitably centre on their interaction with their immediate environment. Consequently, when Mackenzie became headmaster of Junior Secondary School (Scottish equivalent of an English Secondary Modern School) in the Coal fields of Fife, his first question to himself was (Mackenzie, 1970):

What should a Coal Town school be doing to help these pupils find some sense of direction in their journey through life? (p.53)

Mackenzie believed that conventional approaches to education were irrelevant to his "Coal Town" pupils, providing them with a set of hurdles which would leave the pupils with only a sense of failure and inadequacy. His second major question was, therefore:

what had we to do, in the Coal Town School, to make the machine work for our youngsters, and not against them? (p.56)

Another individual who asked similar questions was Michael Duane (Berg, 1968), on behalf of children who he taught from the decaying working class streets of 1960's Islington. Fletcher et al. (1985) describe how Phillip Toogood asked the same questions on behalf of pupils suffering the upheavals concomitant with removal to a Midlands new town. They also describe Stewart Wilson's attempts at the Sutton Centre in Nottingham, and Tim McMullen's at Countesthorpe College in Leicestershire. Another Islington school which must be mentioned in this context is the William Tyndale School (Dale, 1979; Ellis et al., 1976).

The answers these teachers provided to their questions were remarkably similar, and remarkably close, in value terms, to those provided by the "pioneers" of therapeutic education. From the initial assumption that schools and teachers have a duty to promote the social, emotional and educational development of all of their pupils, these mainstream teachers recognized that their pupils, many of whom were from working class and socially deprived backgrounds, would gain only humiliation, failure and frustration from traditional approaches to schooling which employed both method and content which was alien and alienating to their pupils. Traditional approaches to teaching tend to conform to a "transmission"

model (Barnes, 1976), which leaves little or no room for pupils' perceptions of the world, but rather relies upon a pre-ordained stock of knowledge which teachers transmit to their pupils. The common strategy of these new pioneers was to take as their starting point the pupils' knowledge, and to recognize the vital importance of showing respect for the pupils' own culture; only through such recognition could the sorts of productive relationships on which positive pupil development depends, be formed between pupil and teacher. These teachers were all highly conscious of the way in which the families and pupils with whom they worked, as a result of "traditional" approaches, often felt intimidated by and alienated from schools and teachers; this required, as Fletcher et al. (1985) put it:

innovations in roles, relationships and the relative values given to the school subjects studied. More significantly perhaps there was a culture and climate of innovation which were especially concerned with making the school more "open". (p.11)

Not only were these schools "open" in a physical sense to the local communities which they served, but within the schools relationships, particularly those between staff and pupils. They were also more "open" than was traditionally the case. Wilson, at the Sutton Centre, spoke of the "barriers" which he believed educational institutions traditionally set up, both physical and symbolic, between themselves and the community outside. These barriers existed nowhere more obviously than in the classrooms, where pupils were separated from their teachers by status and knowledge (what Marland, 1975, might describe as a certain "school teacherly distance". See chapter 1 of this thesis). Thus, informality in teacher-pupil relationships was encouraged; there was no corporal punishment; pupils' emotional needs were valued as highly as their academic needs, and

self-discipline among pupils was seen as a major aim. These schools sought to produce pupils who would become truly participant members of their communities, and not the blind, unquestioning subjects of authority. Pupils were encouraged to ask questions, to challenge and test new ideas.

The public and "official" reception received by all of these innovators, however, was entirely hostile and rejecting. This hostility was focused at the very heart of these approaches, namely on the question of authority and discipline. Fletcher et al. show, through reference to the minutes of governors' meetings and contemporaneous newspaper reports, the way in which, at the time, the schools were portrayed as chaotic, subversive and corrupting institutions; hotbeds of unbridled delinquency and politically subversive indoctrination. In spite of some limited public recognition of the success achieved by many of these schools in incorporating "difficult" pupils into the mainstream lives of some of these schools, and the recognition of the harmony and high morale which these innovators had brought to their schools, education authorities in England and the Scottish Education Department dismissed all of the head teachers and some of their colleagues who were involved in these innovations. Some schools were closed, others renamed to dispel the stigma of adverse publicity, and other teachers were dispersed through redeployment procedures.

It would be an over simplification to suggest the foregoing account indicates the impossibility of educational reform in mainstream schools, along the lines suggested here, and supported by this thesis. Rutter et al. (1979), Reynolds (1976, 1979, 1984) have shown how limited

steps towards greater pupil involvement in less authoritarian schools is possible, and is taking place, as far as we know, unchallenged.

Furthermore, Countesthorpe College is now an internationally respected example of a successful experiment in progressive education, and although it lost its original head master in the initial furore surrounding its inception, it continues to stand as an emblem of the values which he and others like him espoused (Watts, 1977). These observations may or may not be of comfort to those teachers whose careers were either abruptly curtailed or otherwise hampered as a result of their attempts to champion reform.

Pupils in the present study give testimony which suggests that many schools still fail to meet the fundamental needs of our children, and retain a great deal of the more destructive aspects of traditional authoritarian approaches to pupil-teacher relationships; this view is also supported by research outlined earlier. It has been suggested by some writers that this process of devaluation and degradation is a hidden but necessary outcome of schooling in a capitalist society (Bowles and Gintis, 1977), one of the aims of which is to produce a docile workforce with low aspirations. Apple (1980) argues that such values are transmitted to pupils through a curriculum which presents the world to pupils in the form of certain preordained facts, unsusceptible to argument. Dale (1979), has argued that the William Tyndale affair can be seen as an "attempt to undermine the class structures far as as possible" (p.96) through the unwillingness of many of the staff at that school to produce pupils who were "factory fodder" or "human capital".

In considering the wider range of social and political values which surround state educational institutions, it is clear that the ways in which schools are organized and the effects such organizational features may have on the relationships within those institutions, are of considerable interest to a wide range of people. Teachers often work in situations which are dominated by dubious assumptions relating to the connection between their ability to successfully perform in a "traditionally" authoritarian manner and their competence as teachers, as Denscombe (1985) demonstrates when he deals with the concept of "classroom control". Denscombe shows how "progressive" approaches to classroom management so freely espoused in colleges of education, are often soon replaced by the "traditional" approaches espoused in the staffroom. The latter demand that teachers display "control" over their pupils in highly visible and audible manner, making pupil silence and immobility important indicators of teacher competence among their peers. Such demands are in direct opposition to "progressive" calls for greater pupil participation and pupil initiated talk in lessons.

Against this background the road to reform is unlikely to be smooth. Reform is likely to be cautious. It is not surprising when we read Bridgeland's (1971) account of the pioneer workers with EBD children, that many of these innovators often felt that they derived benefit from the marginal status enjoyed by residential special schools. By virtue of the residential special school's place outside the mainstream it affords a degree of privacy which allows the innovator a relatively free rein, unhampered by those who might otherwise prove a hindrance. It has been shown in the present study, that residential schools can provide for

pupils' needs in ways in which some mainstream schools have failed. In this way the residential schools can be seen to provide the mainstream with a potential learning resource, as well as a support service. And for as long as the necessary reforms in community based services and the organization of mainstream schools take (if they ever occur), schools such as Farfield and Lakeside will provide their pupils with advantages which they are otherwise denied.

REFERENCE SECTION

REFERENCES

- Adams, P., Berg, L., Berger, N., Duane, M. and Ollendorff, R. (1972) *Children's Rights*, London: Panther
- Apple, M. (1980) *Ideology and Curriculum*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Atkinson, P., D. Shore and Rees, T. (1981) "Labouring to Learn? Industrial Training for Slow Learners," in Barton and Tomlinson (1981), *op. cit.*
- Audit Commission (1986) *Making a Reality of Community Care*, London: HMSO
- Badger, B. (1985) "Behavioural Surveys - Some Cautionary Notes," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 3, issue 2, pp.4-11
- Balbernie, R. (1966) *Residential Work with Children*, London: Pergamon
- Ballard, J. (1987) "The Confusion of Attempting to Crack a Family Code," *Social Work Today*, vol.18, issue 42, pp.12-13
- Bandura, A. (1969) "Social Learning Theory of Identificatory Processes," in Goslin, D. (Ed.) (1969) *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, Chicago: McNally
- Barnes, D. (1976) *From Communication to Curriculum*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Barton, L. and Meighan, R. (Eds.) (1979) *Schools Pupils and Deviance*, Nafferton: Nafferton Books
- Barton, L. and Tomlinson, S. (Eds.) (1981) *Special Education: Policy, Practices and Social Issues*, Bath: Harper and Row
- (1984) *Special Education and Social Interests*, Beckenham: Croom Helm
- Baudelot, C. and Establat, R. (1977) "What is a Normal Pupil?" in Gleeson, D. (Ed.) (1977) *Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education*, Nafferton: Nafferton Books
- Berg, L. (1968) *Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Berger, P. (1979) *Invitation to Sociology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967) *The Social Construction of Reality*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Bettelheim, B. (1950) *Love is Not Enough*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press
- (1955) *Truants From Life*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press

- Bettelheim, B. and Sylvester, E. (1948) "A Therapeutic Milieu," in *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol. 18, pp.191-206
- Bogdan, R. and Kugelmass (1984) "Case Studies in Mainstreaming: A Symbolic Interactionist Approach to Special Schooling," in Barton and Tomlinson (1984) *op. cit.*
- Bond, J. (1987) "I'm Only a Bit Thick Now: An Account of an 'On-Site' Unit and the Effects of Attempts to Raise the Self-Esteem of Disaffected Pupils," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 5, issue 1, pp.2-16
- Booth, T. and Coulby, D. (Eds.) (1987) *Producing and Reducing Disaffection*, Milton Keynes: The Open University Press
- Bourdieu, P. (1971) "Systems of Education and Systems of Thought," in Young, M. (Ed.) (1971) *op. cit.*
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1977) *Schooling in Capitalist America*, London: Routedledge and Kegan Paul
- Bridgeland, M. (1971) *Pioneer Work With Maladjusted Children: A Study of the Development of Therapeutic Education*, London: Staples Press
- Burland, R. (1979) "Behaviour Modification in a Residential School for Junior Maladjusted Boys," *Therapeutic Education*, vol. 7, pp.65-79
- Burn, M. (1956) *Mr. Lyward's Answer: A Successful Experiment in Education*, London: Hamish Hamilton
- Cahn, S. (Ed.) (1970) *The Philosophical Foundations of Education*, New York: Harper Row
- Carnell, C. (1983) "Disturbed Pupils' Perceptions of the Personality Characteristics of their Teachers," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 2, issue 1, pp.24-27
- Cawson, P. and Martell, M. (1979) *Children Referred to Closed Units*, London: HMSO
- Clough, R. (1982) *Residential Work*, London: Macmillan
- Coard, B. (1971) *How the West Indian Child is Made Educationally Subnormal in the British School System*, London: New Beacon
- Cohen, L. and Manion L. (1980) *Research Methods in Education*, London: Croom Helm
- Cole, T. (1981) *The Use of Residential Education to Improve Pupils' Self Image*, Unpublished M.Ed thesis, University of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne

- Cole, T. (1986) *Residential Special Education*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Cooling, M. (1974) *Educational Provision for Maladjusted Children in Boarding Schools*, Unpublished M.Ed thesis, Birmingham University
- Cooper, P. (1985) "The Perceptions of Parents of a Residential School for Pupils with Behavioural and Emotional Problems," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 3, issue 3, pp.21-29
- Cornish, D. and Clarke, R. (1975) *Residential Treatment and its Effects on Delinquency*, London: HMSO
- Coulby, D. (1987) "It's Nothing Personal: Class Opposition to the Curriculum," in Booth and Coulby (Eds.) (1987) *op. cit.*
- Cosin, B., Dale, I., Esland, G., Mackinnon, D. and Swift, D. (Eds.) (1977) *School and Society*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Cosin, B. and Hales M. (Eds.) (1983) *Education, Policy and Society: Theoretical Perspectives*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Croall, J. (1983) *Neill of Summerhill: the Permanent Rebel*, London: Ark
- Cronk, K. (1987) *Teacher-Pupil Conflict in Secondary Schools*, London: Falmer
- Dain, P. (1977) "Disruptive Children at the Key Centre," *Remedial Education*, vol. 12, issue 4, pp.163-177
- Dale, R. (1979) "The Politicization of School Deviance: Reactions to William Tyndale," in Barton and Neighan (Eds.) *op. cit.*
- Davies, L. (1984) *Pupil Power: Deviance and Gender in School*, Lewes: The Falmer Press
- Davis, A. (1981) *The Residential Solution*, London: Tavistock Publications
- Dawson, R. (1980) *Special Provision for Disturbed Pupils: A Survey*, Basingstoke: Macmillan
- (1981) "The Place of Four Pioneer Tenets in Modern Practice and Opinion," *New Growth*, vol. 1, issue 2, pp.44-47
- (1984) "Disturbed Pupils' Perceptions of Their Teachers' Support and Strictness," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 2, issue 1, pp.24-27

- Dawson, R. (1985) "Disturbed Pupils' Perceptions of the Behaviour and Friendliness of Other Pupils, Their School Work and School Satisfaction," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 3, issue 1, pp.21-25
- Denscombe, M. (1985) *Classroom Control: A Sociological Perspective*, London: Allen and Unwin
- D.E.S. (1967) *Children and Their Primary Schools*, London: HMSO
- (1983) *Statistics in Education, Table A22*, London: HMSO
- (1989) *A Survey of Provision for Pupils with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties in Maintained Special Schools and Units*, London: DES
- (1989) *Discipline in Schools*, Report of the Committee of Enquiry Chaired by Lord Elton
- Dierenfield, R. (1982) "All You Need to Know About Disruption," *The Times Educational Supplement*, 29th January, 1982
- Dowling, E. and Osborne, E. (1985) *The Family and the School: A Joint Systems Approach*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Duane, M. (1972) "Freedom and the State System of Education," in Adams et al., *op. cit.*
- Dunlop, A. (1974) *The Approved School Experience*, London: HMSO
- Eggleston, J. (1979) "The Construction of Deviance in School," in Barton and Meighan (Eds.) (1979) *op. cit.*
- Ellis, T., McWhirter, J., McColgan, D. and B. Haddow (1976) *William Tyndale: the Teachers' Story*, London: Writers' and Readers' Co-operative
- Etzioni, A. (1975) *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*, New York: The Free Press
- Fletcher, C., Caron, M. and Williams, W. (1985) *Schools on Trial*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Ford, J., Mongon, D and Whelan, M (1982) *Special Education and Social Control*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Freire, P. (1972) *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Frude, N. and Gault, H. (Eds.) (1984) *Disruptive Behaviour in Schools*, Chicester: Wiley
- Furlong, V. (1985) *The Deviant Pupil: Sociological Perspectives*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press

- Galletley, I. (1984) "Shared Leadership in the School - 'Primus Inter Pares'," in Bowers, T. (Ed.) (1984) *Management and the Special School*, Beckenham: Croom Helm
- Galloway, D. and Goodwin, C. (1979) *Educating Slow Learning and Maladjusted Children: Integration or Segregation?* London: Longman
- (1987) *The Education of Disturbing Children*, London: Longman
- Galwey, J. (1979) "What Pupils Think of Special Units," *Comprehensive Education*, 39, pp. 18-20
- Gibson, J. (1984) "Comparative Views on Educating Students With Special Needs," *School Psychology International*, vol. 5, issue 2, pp.24-34
- Gill, A. (1989) "Putting Fun Back into Families," *Social Work Today*, vol. 20, issue 34, pp.14-15
- Gillham, B. (Ed.) (1981) *Problem Behaviour in the Secondary School*, London: Croom Helm
- (1984) "School Organization and the Control of Disruptive Incidents," in Frude and Gault, *op. cit.*
- Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1968) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson
- Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- (1968) *Stigma*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Goode, D. (1984) "Socially Produced Identities, Intimacy and the Problem of the Retarded," in Barton and Tomlinson (Eds.) (1984) *op. cit.*
- Handy, C. (1981) *Understanding Organizations*, (3rd. edn.) Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Handy, C. and Aitken, R. (1986) *Understanding Schools as Organizations*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Hargreaves, D. (1967) *Social Relations in a Secondary School*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- (1981) *Challenge for the Comprehensive School*, London: Harper and Row
- Hargreaves, D., Hestor, S. and Mellor, I. (1975) *Deviance in Classrooms*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Harris, K. (1979) *Education and Knowledge*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

- Head, D. (Ed.) (1974) *Free Way To Learning*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Hemming, J. (1980) *The Betrayal of Youth*, London: Marion Boyars
- Hoghugh, M. (1978) *Troubled and Troublesome: Coping With Severely Disordered Children*, London: Burnett Books
- (1983) *The Delinquent: Directions For Social Control*, London: Burnett Books
- Holly, D. (1973) *Beyond Curriculum*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- (Ed.) (1974) *Education or Domination*, London: Arrow
- Holman, B. (1981) *Kids at the Door*, Oxford: Blackwell
- Hughes, E., Becker, H. and Geer, B. (1971) "Student Culture and Academic Effort," in Cosin et al. (Eds.) (1971) *op. cit.*
- Hurst, A. (1984) "Adolescence and Physical Impairment: An Interactionist View," in Barton and Tomlinson (Eds.) (1984) *op. cit.*
- Illich, I. (1973) *Deschooling Society*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Jervis, M. (1988) "An Alternative to Fostering, Can it Work?" *Social Work Today*, 19, 22, 14-15
- Jones, D. (1979) "An Interactionist Approach to Therapeutic Intervention in Day and Residential Care," *Therapeutic Education*, vol. 7, issue 2, pp.79-89
- Jones, H. (1960) *Reluctant Rebels*, London: Tavistock Publications
- Khan, J., Nursten, J. and Carroll, H. (1981, 3rd edn.) *Unwillingly to School*, Oxford: Pergamon
- Keddie, N. (1971) "Classroom Knowledge," in M. Young (Ed.) (1971) *op. cit.*
- King, J., Sinclair, I. and Clarke, R. (1975) *Varieties of Residential Care*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- King, R. (1973) *School Organization and Pupil Involvement*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Laing, A. and Chazan, M. (1987) *Teachers' Strategies in Coping With Behaviour Difficulties in First Year Junior School Children*, Birmingham: Association of Workers for Maladjusted Children
- Lambert, R. (1975) *The Chance of a Lifetime: A Study of Boys and Coeducational Boarding Schools in England and Wales?* London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson
- Lambert, R. and Millham, S. (1968) *The Hothouse Society*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Lampen, J. and Neill, T. (1985) "A Bucket of Cold Water: A Follow-Up Study in a Residential Special School," *Journal of Adolescence*,

vol. 8, pp.271-287

- Laslett, R. (1977) *Educating Maladjusted Children*, London: Granada
- (1983) *Changing Perceptions of Maladjusted Children: 1945-1981*, Birmingham: Association of Workers for Maladjusted Children
- (1985) "A Follow-Up Study of Children Leaving Three Residential Schools for the Maladjusted," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 3, issue 1, pp.13-19
- Lawrence, J., Steed, D. and Young, P. (1978) "Monitoring Incidents of Disruptive Behaviour in a Secondary School," *Durham and Newcastle Research Review*, vol. 7, issue 4
- (1984) *Disruptive Children - Disruptive Schools?* Beckenham: Croom Helm
- Lemert, E. (1967) *Human Deviance: Social Problems and Social Control*, New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs
- Lennhoff, F. (1966 - second edn.) *Exceptional Children*, Northampton: John Dicken & co. Ltd.
- Levitas, M. (1974) *Marxist Perspectives in the Sociology of Education*, London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. and White R. (1939) "Patterns of Aggressive Behaviour in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'," in Pugh, D. (Ed.) (1971) *Organization Theory*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Mackenzie, R. (1970) *State School*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Mahoney, P. (1985) *Schools for the Boys*, London: Hutchinson
- Marland, M. (1975) *The Craft of the Classroom: A Survival Guide*, London: Heinemann
- Matza, D. (1976) "Signification," in Hammersley and Woods (Eds.) (1976) *op. cit.*
- Maybin, M., Phelan, J. and Dixon, N. (1984) *Sharonmore: Caring for Troubled Children and Their Families*, Belfast: Dr. Barnardo's
- McGregor McMaster, J. (Ed.) (1982) *Methods in Social and Educational Caring*, Aldershot: Gower
- Mead, G. (1932) "The Self," in Worsley, P. (Ed.) (1978) *Modern Sociology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Miller, E. and Gwynne, G. (1972) *A Life Apart*, London: Tavistock
- Millham, S. (1987) "Residential Schools: Issues and Developments,"

Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education, vol. 5, issue 2,
pp.4-11

- Millham, S., Bullock, R. and Cherrett (1975) *After Grace - Teeth: A Comparative Study of the Residential Experience of Boys in Approved Schools*, London: Chaucer
- Millham, S., Bullock, R. and Hosie, K. (1978) *Locking Up Children*, Farnborough: Saxon House
- Millham, K., Bullock, R., Hosie, K. and Haak, M. (1986) *Lost in Care*, Aldershot: Gower
- Mortimore, P., Davies, J., West, A., Varlaam, A., Devine, P. and Mazza, J. (1983) *Behaviour Problems in Schools: An Evaluation of Support Centres*, Beckenham: Croom Helm
- Neill, A. (1916) *A Dominie's Log*, London: Herbert Jenkins
- (1921) *A Dominie in Doubt*, London: Herbert Jenkins
- (1968) *Summerhill*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- (1972) "Freedom Works," in Adams et al., *op. cit.*
- Olweus, D. (1984) "Aggressors and Their Victims: Bullying at School," in Frude and Gault (Eds.) *op. cit.*
- Oswin, M. (1978) *Children in Long Stay Hospitals*, London: Allen Lane
- Parsons, T. (1951) *The Social System*, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press
- (1961) "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations," in Etzioni, A. (Ed.) *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston
- Perrow, C. (1979) *Complex Organizations*, (2nd edn.) Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- Polsky, H. (1962) *Cottage Six: The Social System of Delinquent Boys in Residential Treatment*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Potter, P. (1986) *Long Term Residential Child Care: the Positive Approach*, Norwich: University of East Anglia and Social Work Today
- Powell, A. (1977) "Assessment and Treatment Practice with Maladjusted Children," *The Journal of the Association of Workers for Maladjusted Children*, vol. 5, issue 1, pp.106-113
- Pringle, M. (1980) *The Needs of Children*, (2nd edn.) London: Hutchinson
- Reid, K. (1985) *Truancy and School Absenteeism*, London: Hodder and Stoughton

- Reid, J. (1987) "A Problem in the Family: Explanations Under Strain," in Booth and Coulby (Eds.) (1987) *op. cit.*
- Reynolds, D. (1976) "The Delinquent School," in Hammersley and Woods (Eds.) (1976) *op. cit.*
- Reynolds, D. (1984) "The School for Vandals: A Sociological Portrait of the Disaffection Prone School," in Frude and Gault (Eds.) (1984) *op. cit.*
- Reynolds, D. and Sullivan, M. (1979) "Bringing Schools Back In," in Barton and Meighan (Eds.) *op. cit.*
- Righton, P. (1975) "Planned Environmental Therapy: A Reappraisal," *Journal of the Association of Workers for Maladjusted Children*, vol. 3, issue 1, pp.3-11
- Rist, R. (1977) "On Understanding the Process of Schooling: the Contribution of Labelling Theory," in Karabel, J. and Halsey, K. (Eds.) (1977) *Power and Ideology in Education*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Rogers, C. (1978) "The Interpersonal Relationship in the Facilitation of Learning," in Rich, J. (Ed.) (1978) *Innovations in Education*, New York: Allyn and Bacon
- Rose, M. (1978) "Residential Treatment - a Total Therapy," *Journal of the Association of Workers for Maladjusted Children*, vol. 6, issue 1, pp.3-17
- Rosenhan, D. (1973) "Being Sane in Insane Places," in Rubington, E. and Weinberg, M. (Eds.) (1981) *Deviance: The Interactionist Perspective*, New York: Macmillan
- Rosser, E. and Harré, R. (1976) "The Meaning of Trouble," in Hammersley and Woods (Eds.) (1976) *op. cit.*
- Rowitz, L. and Gunn, J. (1984) "The Labelling of Educable Mentally Retarded Children," in Barton and Tomlinson (Eds.) (1984) *op. cit.*
- Rubenstein, D. and Stoneman, C. (Eds.) (1970) *Education for Democracy*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Rutter, M. (1975) *Helping Troubled Children*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Rutter, M., Cox, A., Berger, M. and Yule, W. (1975) "Attainment and Adjustment in Two Geographical Areas. I: The Prevalence of Psychiatric Disorder," *British Journal of Psychiatry*, vol. 126, pp.493-509
- Rutter, M. and Giller, H. (1983) *Juvenile Delinquency: Trends and Perspectives*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P. and Ouston, J. (1979) *Fifteen*

Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children, Exeter: Open Books

Rutter, M., Tizard, J. and Whitmore, K. (1970) *Education, Health and Behaviour*, London: Longman

Ryan, J. and Thomas, D. (1980) *The Politics of Mental Handicap*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Schostak, J. (1982) "Black Side of Schooling," *The Times Educational Supplement*, 25th June, 1982

(1983) *Maladjusted Schooling: Social Control and Individuality in Secondary Schooling*, London: Falmer Press

"Lifting Up Stones: a Housemaster's Day," in Booth and Coulby (Eds.) (1987) *op. cit.*

Schutz, A. (1967) *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, North West University Press

Scottish Education Department (The Pack Report) (1977) *Truancy and Indiscipline in Schools in Scotland*, London: HMSO

Sewell, G. (1981) "The Micro-Sociology of Segregation: Case Studies in the Exclusion of Children with Special Needs," in Barton and Tomlinson (Eds.) (1981) *op. cit.*

Sharp, R. and Green, A. (1975) *Education and Social Control*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Shaw, O. (1965) *Maladjusted Boys*, London: Allen and Unwin

(1969) *Prisoners of the Mind*, London: Allen and Unwin

Shearer, A. (1980) *Handicapped Children in Residential Care*, London: Bedford Square Press

Shuttleworth, R. (1983) "Wheels Within Wheels: a Systems Approach to Maladjustment," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 1, issue 2, pp.32-40

(1986) "Alternative methods of Communicating with Children in Family Therapy," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 4, issue 2, pp.55-66

Silberman, C. (1970) *Crisis in the Classroom*, New York: Random House

Silverman, D. (1970) *The Theory of Organizations*, Guildford: Heinemann

Squibb, P. (1978) "The Concept of Intelligence," in Worsley, P. (Ed.) (1978) *Modern Sociology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

- (1981) "A Theoretical Structural Approach to Special Education," in Barton and Tomlinson (Eds.) (1981) *op. cit.*
- Stott, D. (1982) *Helping the Maladjusted Child*, Milton Keynes: Open U.P.
- Street, E. and Treacher, A. (1986) "Developmental Closure - a Family Systems Approach to Separation into Residential Care," *MATE*, 4, 2, 42-47
- Swalles, A. (1979) "Experiment at the Parkhead Centre, " *Special Education: Forward Trends*, vol. 6, issue 1, 1979, pp.23-25
- Tattum, D. (1982) *Disruptive Pupils in Schools and Units*, Chichester: Wiley
- (1985) "Disruptive Pupil Behaviour: a Sociological Perspective," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 3, issue 2, pp.12-18
- Taylor, D. and Dowling, E. (1986) "The Clinic Goes to School: Setting Up an Outreach Service," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 4, issue 2, pp.12-18
- Tizard, J., Sinclair, I. and Clarke, R. (1975) *Varieties of Residential Experience*, London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul
- Tomlinson, S. (1981) "The Social Construction of the ESN(M) Child," in Barton and Tomlinson (Eds.) (1981) *op. cit.*
- (1982) *A Sociology of Special Education*, London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul
- Topping, K. (1983) *Educational Systems or Disruptive Adolescents*, London: Croom Helm
- Tutt, N. (1983) "Maladjustment - a Sociological Perspective," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 1, issue 2, pp.7-14
- Underwood, J. (1955) *Report of the Committee on Maladjusted Behaviour*, London: HMSO
- Upton, G., Bundy, C. and Speed, B. (1986) "Parental and Family Involvement in Residential Schools for the Maladjusted," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 4, issue 2, pp.3-11
- van der Eyken, W. and Turner, B. (1975) *Adventures in Education*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Wagner, G. (for the National Institute for Social Work) (1988) *Residential Care: a Positive Choice. Report of the Independent Review of Residential Care*, London: HMSO
- Varnock, H. (1978) *Special Educational Needs. Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped People and Young People*, London: HMSO

- Warren, T. (1986) "Token Economy in the Classroom: an Account of the Development of a Behavioural System for Educationally and Emotionally Disturbed Children at a Residential School," *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education*, vol. 4, issue 3, pp.49-55
- Watts, J. (1977) *The Countesthorpe Experience*, London: Unwin
- Weber, M. (1947) "Legitimate Authority and Bureaucracy," in Pugh, D. (Ed.) (1971) *Organization Theory*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- West, D. and Farrington, D. (1973) *Who becomes Delinquent?* London: Heinemann
- Whitaker, D., Cooke, J., Dunne, C. and Rockcliffe, S. (1984) *The Experience of Residential Care from the Perspectives of Children, Parents and Care Givers*, (SSRC funded report) University of York, Social Policy and Social Work Department
- Whitehead, A. (1932) *The Aims of Education*, London: Williams and Northgate
- Willis, P. (1978) *Learning to Labour*, Aldershot: Gower
- Willmott, P. (1966) *Adolescent Boys in East London*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Wills, W. (1941) *The Hawkspur Experiment*, London: Allen and Unwin
- (1945) *The Barns Experiment*, London: Allen and Unwin
- (1960) *Throw Away Thy Rod: Living With Difficult Children*, London: Gollanz
- (1971) *Spare the Child: the Story of an Experimental Approved School*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Wilson, M. and Evans, M. (1980) (Schools Council Working Paper 65) *Education of Disturbed Pupils*, London: Methuen
- Woods, P. (1976) "Having a Laugh: an Antidote to Schooling," in Hammersley and Woods (Eds.) (1976) *op. cit.*
- (1984) "A Sociological Analysis of Disruptive Incidents," in Frude and Gault (Eds.) (1984) *op. cit.*
- Young, M. (1971) *Knowledge and Control*, London: Collier MacMillan